Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-142
Tuesday
24 July 1990

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-142 *24 July 1990*

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Chernyshev Ponders West's Sincerity on Arms Cuts *[TASS]* 1
Ovchinnikov Cited on Need To Cut Naval Arms *[TASS]* 1

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Soviet Trawler Collides With Panamanian Tanker *[Moscow TV]* 3
CSCE Summit Preparations Reported *[IZVESTIYA 22 Jul]* 3
NATO's Woerner Reviews Talks in Moscow *[TASS]* 3
'International Situation' Program Aired 20 July *[Moscow Radio]* 3
Changing Face of East-West Ties Analyzed *[PRAVDA 20 Jul]* 5

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Bush Argues for Peace Through Strength *[Vasilyev in PRAVDA 24 Jul]* 8
Gorbachev Greets Goodwill Games in Seattle *[Moscow TV]* 8
Baker's Plan for Expert Economic Aid Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 21 Jul]* 8
Supreme Soviet Delegation Meets Congressmen *[TASS]* 9
Deputy Foreign Minister Receives U.S. Official *[TASS]* 10

China

More on PRC's Congress Leader's Visit *[Moscow International]* 10
Laptev Meets PRC Delegation *[IZVESTIYA 22 Jul]* 10
Compromise Needed to Reduce Troops on Border *[Moscow International]* 11
'Sovereignty, Equality' Needed for PRC Trade *[Moscow International]* 11

Northeast Asia

Conference on Japanese Business Ties Held *[Moscow International]* 11
Sakhalin-Hokkaido Air Link Inaugurated *[TASS]* 12
DPRK Illegal Fishing Boat Dispute Continues *[IZVESTIYA 15 Jul]* 12
Decision in Case Appealed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 14 Jul]* 13
Ministry Issues Statement *[Moscow Radio]* 13

Near East & South Asia

More on Indian Prime Minister Singh's Visit 13
Singh Interviewed *[PRAVDA 22 Jul]* 13
Constitutes First Summit-Level Meeting *[Delhi Radio]* 15
Ryzhkov Heads First Round of Talks With Singh *[Delhi Radio]* 15
Trade, Economic Prospects Viewed *[TASS]* 15
Gorbachev, Singh Sign Statement of Cooperation *[Moscow Radio]* 16
'Text' of Joint Statement *[TASS]* 16
Gorbachev Hosts Dinner for Indian Premier *[TASS]* 17
Gorbachev Makes Dinner Address *[TASS]* 17
Singh Gives Dinner Speech *[TASS]* 18
Talks Termed 'Productive' *[TASS]* 20
Talks with Ryzhkov Continue 24 Jul *[TASS]* 20

1 Soviet Killed, 2 Injured in Kabul Shelling *[TASS]* 20
Shelling Called 'Barbaric' *[Moscow TV]* 20
Afghan Efforts To Release POW's Detailed *[Moscow Radio]* 20
Tensions Heighten Between Iraq, Kuwait *[Zlatorunskiy on Moscow International]* 21
Arms Sales, Military Ties to Libya Cited *[NEW TIMES No 29]* 21

East Europe

Commentator Views Improving Albania Ties *[Surguchev on Moscow Radio]* 23
Bulgarian Paper Cited on Wave of Emigration *[IZVESTIYA 18 Jul]* 24
Supreme Soviet Chairman, Bulgarian Official Meet *[IZVESTIYA 20 Jul]* 25
Communist Party of Czechoslovakia Viewed *[Sidorovich on Moscow International]* 25
Czechoslovak Envoy Views Ties in Wake of Change *[PRAVDA 20 Jul]* 25
Hungary's EEC Membership, NATO Ties Debated *[IZVESTIYA 22 Jul]* 26
Dialogue Recommended Following Events in Romania *[IZVESTIYA 15 Jul]* 26
Romania's Iliescu Cited on 13 June Events *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 10 Jul]* 27

West Europe

Further on European Community's Delor's Visit 28
Ryzhkov, Delors Give Dinner Speeches *[IZVESTIYA 21 Jul]* 28
Visit Goes 'Beyond Framework' *[IZVESTIYA 22 Jul]* 31

Latin America & Caribbean

Cuban Debate on 'Loyalty to Ideals' Viewed *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 15 Jul]* 31
CPSU Greets Colombian Party on Anniversary *[PRAVDA 17 Jul]* 33

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

28th CPSU Congress

Marxist Platform's Buzgalin Views Congress *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 20 Jul]* 34
Congress Delegates Polled on Attitudes *[PRAVDA 21 Jul]* 35

Political & Social

Revenko Views Union Treaty Drafting Issues *[TASS]* 37
Gorbachev, Top Leaders Hold 'Working Conference' *[Moscow Radio]* 38
New Party Leaders Air Current Issues *[TASS]* 38
Interior Ministry Spokesman on Ethnic Unrest *[TASS]* 38
Ligachev Intention To Write Memoirs Noted *[TRUD 21 Jul]* 39
Democratic Leader Moves Against Moscow Party *[Moscow Radio]* 39
Democratic Platform Faces Financial Difficulties *[Moscow TV]* 39
Disunity of Democratic 'Informals' Lamented *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 22 Jul]* 39
Council of Ministers Food Commission Session Held *[IZVESTIYA 22 Jul]* 40
Officer Alleges KGB Knew of Katyn Massacre *[London MOSCOW NEWS No 8]* 40
Lawyer Attacks 'Spirit' of Draft Law on KGB *[NEW TIMES No 29]* 41
MVD Department Head Discusses Weapons Control *[IZVESTIYA 21 Jun]* 41
Dismantling of Nuclear Submarines Protested *[Moscow Radio]* 42
Roundtable Discussion on Trade Unions Examined *[PRAVDA 30 Jun]* 43
Program Examines Future of Television *[Moscow TV]* 51
Nature of Election Process Questioned *[IZVESTIYA 22 Jul]* 55
Court's Power Over Press Freedom Pondered *[IZVESTIYA 10 Jul]* 56
'Avalanche' of Jewish Emigration Viewed *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 28]* 61
Gorbachev, Military Men Sign Writer's Obituary *[PRAVDA 19 Jul]* 62
Leaders Sign War Poet's Obituary *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 18 Jul]* 62
Magazine Launches Russian-Language Edition *[TASS]* 62

Economic

Finance Minister Delivers Television Address *[Moscow TV]* 63
Ryzhkov Delivers Report on Market Reform *[IZVESTIYA 23 Jul]* 64

Military

Baltic Commander Cited on Military Reform *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 21 Jul]* 73

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

Further Reportage on Preparations for Talks *[Moscow Radio]* 75
Lithuania Giving Priority to Talks With RSFSR *[TASS]* 75
Dobychin Criticizes Lithuanian Leadership *[IZVESTIYA 20 Jul]* 75
Pro-CPSU Lithuanian Party Holds Plenum *[Moscow Radio]* 75
Hears Report *[Moscow Radio]* 76
Brazauskas Interviewed on Lithuania's Communists *[Warsaw TRYBUNA 18 Jul]* 76
New Director of Lithuanian News Agency Named *[Vilnius Radio]* 77
Lenin Monument Defaced in Lithuania *[Moscow Radio]* 77
Interethnic Relations in Estonia Stabilize *[TASS]* 77
Poll on Nationality Issues in Estonia Reported *[Tallinn International]* 78
Estonian Party Veterans on Soviet Takeover *[Tallinn International]* 78
Latvian Supreme Soviet Discusses KGB *[Riga Radio]* 78
KGB Status in Latvia Under Review *[IZVESTIYA 19 Jul]* 79
Agreement Signed on Baltic Sea Protection *[Riga Radio]* 79
Anniversary of Soviet Baltic Rule Reported *[Moscow Radio]* 80
Baltics Observe Anniversary *[Moscow TV]* 80
Pro-CPSU Communists Celebrate *[Moscow TV]* 81
Rubiks Speaks at Anniversary Meeting *[Moscow Radio]* 81
Commentary on Anniversary *[Moscow Radio]* 81
Comparison—Supreme Soviet Appeal to Baltics 81

RSFSR

Yeltsin Interviewed on CPSU, Gorbachev *[Vienna KURIER 23 Jul]* 82
Russian Supreme Soviet Issues Resolutions 83
Government Membership Ratified *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 19 Jul]* 83
Media Resolution *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 19 Jul]* 83
Official Privileges *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 20 Jul]* 84
Federal Treaty *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 20 Jul]* 84
Foreign Economic Ties *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 20 Jul]* 84
Union Demands on North Russia Questioned *[IZVESTIYA 14 Jul]* 85
Conference Views Mechanics of Local Power *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 18 Jul]* 87
Russians Leaving To Live in Lithuania *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 19 Jul]* 87
Ordzhonikidze To Revert to Name of Vladikavkaz *[Moscow Radio]* 88
Perm Farmers Threaten To Suspend Food Deliveries *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 22 Jul]* 88
Fire Shuts Down Smolensk Nuclear Power Station *[IZVESTIYA 24 Jul]* 88
Severe Flood Follows Heavy Rain in Siberia *[TASS]* 89
*Voting Records From RSFSR Legislature *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 26]* 89

Western Republics

Belorussian Ministries, Departments To Be Reduced *[Moscow Radio]* 114
Belorussia Rewords Constitution Article 6 *[PRAVDA 21 Jul]* 114
Contenders for Ivashko Office Named *[PRAVDA 19 Jul]* 115
New Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Chairman Elected *[Moscow TV]* 115
Oliynk Cited on Ukraine's Sovereighty Declaration *[Kiev International]* 115
Ukrainian Nationalists Seek Own Army *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 20 Jul]* 115
Ukraine To Mark 'Days of Cossack Glory' *[Kiev International]* 117
Monuments to Lenin, Marx To Be Dismantled *[Kiev International]* 117

Caucasus

Armenian Supreme Soviet Session Opens *[Moscow Radio]* 118
Arms Seizures Viewed *[Yerevan Radio]* 118
Soviet Army Actions Viewed *[Moscow TV]* 118
Difficulties Discussed *[Moscow Radio]* 119
Movsisyan Addresses Armenian Party Plenum *[Moscow Radio]* 119
Armenia's Trade Ties Decision Endorsed *[Yerevan International]* 119
Yerevan Committee To Function Independently *[Yerevan ARMENPRES]* 119
Nagorno-Karabakh Control Committee Suspended *[BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY 14 Jul]* 120
Azerbaijan Suspends Gadrutskiy Rayon Powers *[BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY 14 Jul]* 120
Tbilsi District Officer's House Picketed *[Moscow Radio]* 121

Central Asia

Further on Osh Oblast Interethnic Conflict 121
Curfew Extended; Groups Banned *[TASS]* 121
Russians Voice Concerns *[Frunze Radio]* 121
'Grave' Situation Viewed *[Moscow TV]* 122
Masaliyev on Stabilization *[Moscow TV]* 122
Ministry Outlines Situation *[TASS]* 123
Deputies Study 'Conflict' *[Moscow TV]* 123
Commission Opens Investigation *[Moscow Radio]* 124
Commission Visits Rayons *[Moscow Radio]* 124
Students, Manager Killed *[Moscow Radio]* 124

Chernyshev Ponders West's Sincerity on Arms Cuts

LD2307212290 Moscow TASS in English 2109 GMT 23 Jul 90

[By TASS military affairs analyst Vladimir Chernyshev]

[Text] Moscow July 24 TASS—President George Bush told the American military at the launching ceremony of the new aircraft carrier George Washington what they wanted to hear (in the opinion of the CBS TV company) most of all: Aircraft carriers are an indispensable weapon in U.S. arsenals.

Statements by the President during his three-day trip across Western states which was devoted to the forthcoming elections, contained elements which can satisfy not only the American military but also those in the Soviet Union who criticised, at the 28th Communist Party congress, the Soviet foreign and military policy based on new thinking.

At the same time his speech at the launching ceremony disappoints those in the USSR who insists on deeper cuts in the Armed Forces and armaments and who advocates the further reduction in military production on mutual conditions.

During his trip, Bush returned to the traditional theme of "peace from the position of strength" which was absent in his speeches for a long time. Such a relapse is quite surprising.

It does not tally with ideas about the end of the cold war and about considerable improvement in Soviet-American relations and East-West relations as a whole.

Bush's statement that the United States should continue "the policy of confrontation" also evokes concern.

The following question comes to one's mind involuntarily: Were statements by the United States and NATO that they do not see an enemy in the Soviet Union any more and extend it a hand of friendship and cooperation sincere?

Facts show that the United States continue to prioritise the production of military means to dominate over the Soviet Union. The U.S. key thesis says that U.S. security necessitates military supremacy by the improvement of nuclear and conventional technologies.

Top priority is given to the production of the third generation of nuclear weapons, space-based ABM systems under the SDI programme and new ultra-precise systems of conventional weapons.

Far from cutting its military presence in the world, Washington seeks to consolidate the grip on bases situated on foreign territories (Greece, the Philippines, etc.) The United States tries to conclude new agreements to use foreign territories to support operations of its Navy (talks with Singapore).

The above shows that there is a gap between the West's declarations and real deeds.

The U.S. administration and NATO leaders have not yet understood that security needs deep cuts and not modernisation of weapons and that it is necessary to make radical changes in strategy to strengthen stability and not to achieve superiority.

Ovchinnikov Cited on Need To Cut Naval Arms

LD2307100190 Moscow TASS in English 0839 GMT 23 Jul 90

[Text] Moscow July 23 TASS—The process of disarmament can evolve successfully only if it is all-inclusive. Stability and trust cannot be built by limiting reductions to land forces and regarding the navy as "sacred," political news analyst Vsevolod Ovchinnikov writes in today's PRAVDA.

He comments on the results of an international symposium in Wellington "On Security in the Asia-Pacific Region."

Washington does not want to discuss with Moscow security in the Asia-Pacific region because the Americans are content with their present dominant positions in the region. At disarmament talks, the Pentagon seeks parity with the Soviet Union on land by maintaining U.S. superiority on the seas, the analyst points out.

U.S. Representative Richard Fieldhouse said in his report at the seminar that over the past four years the Soviet side has made many proposals to reduce naval arms.

However, the U.S. side invariably regarded them negatively. In particular the United States rejected the suggested elimination of all sea-launched nuclear systems, except submarine-launched ballistic missiles.

Fieldhouse believes that such a measure could be the most important suggestion and concludes that the time has come to involve the Navy and its activities in the overall arms control process.

Ovchinnikov thinks that, apart from military-and-strategic considerations, there are serious trade-and-economic factors favouring the idea.

According to the influential American journal "FOREIGN POLICY," the main threat to the United States is posed not by Soviet military might in the region but by U.S. inability to compete against its military allies, which are at the same time its economic rivals: Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan.

The relaxation of tension in the Asia-Pacific region in the military field would allow the United States to cut military spending, which amounts to $42 billion, and to focus on economic aspects of security.

The international symposium, which was held on the initiative of New Zealand Disarmament Minister Fran Wild, educated participants about how common dangers to mankind had brought nations closer together.

The inhabitants of secluded islands grasped the interrelationship of the present-day world and displayed an ability to think and act in a new way, in line with the call of the times, Ovchinnikov writes.

Soviet Trawler Collides With Panamanian Tanker

LD2307192890 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 23 Jul 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] According to a TASS correspondent's report, a collision has occurred in the Pacific Ocean between the large autonomous Soviet trawler Balakhna and the Panama tanker Erik Jacob which should have supplied the trawler with fuel. The collision occurred during the mooring of the vessels. There are no victims, and there is no leak of petroleum products. The reason for the accident is being investigated.

CSCE Summit Preparations Reported

PM2407090590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Jul 90 Morning Edition p 5

[Report by S. Tosunyan: "Beginning Instills Hope"]

[Text] Vienna—The preparatory committee for the summit conference of the 35 CSCE member states is sitting for the second week in Vienna's Hofburg Palace.

The preparatory committee is the third CSCE forum working in the Austrian capital (here in Vienna talks have been under way since last year on conventional armed forces and on confidence-building and security measures in Europe).

The committee's plenary sessions are being held in the marble hall. The delegations take their seats at long tables set in the shape of a large rectangle. At 1030 hours the chairman pounds a hammer to announce the start of the official part of the talks. But in the evening the atmosphere changes. The participants move to a communal table closer to each other and talk without regulations or formalities. They feel even freer during the "coffee breaks." A no less fruitful lively exchange of opinions continues over a cup of coffee. The delegation agreed on this form of work on the very first day of the meeting. And they are not regretting it.

In a brief time the delegations have been able to determine in general outlines the rough draft for the forthcoming summit meeting. Experts must now bring together the proposals which have been put forward.

The USSR delegation was the first to submit its project with detailed provisions for the questions which could lie at the basis of the summit agenda. They concern in particular the ensuring of stability on the continent through the further deepening of the CSCE process, the settlement of foreign aspects of the building of German unity, and the formation of future security structures in Europe.

Following the Soviet delegation the EC states also submitted a draft. In particular it proposes that the Paris conference should examine documents concerning the creation of a new system of relations between states in the light of the profound changes taking place on the continent.

The delegations of the neutral countries submitted a detailed document in many ways in keeping with the drafts of the USSR and the EEC countries. It sets forth elements of the European peaceful order and the efforts which must be made to strengthen cooperation in the field of the economy, science and technology, and the environment.

The U.S. delegation prefers to the detailed form a more general form of presentation of the subject matter of the future summit. Nonetheless in their draft the Americans suggest that that the new situation in Europe and the prospects of the CSCE process should be examined in Paris without fail. In addition the U.S. delegation put forward an interesting proposal: Alongside the meeting of the heads of the 35 countries' foreign policy departments in Vienna, which is already scheduled and which will examine the draft documents, an intermediate meeting of ministers should be held in New York 1 and 2 October. That will be the first CSCE event on American soil.

In brief, everyone hear believes that the beginning of the preparatory committee's work is promising.

NATO's Woerner Reviews Talks in Moscow

LD2407091690 Moscow TASS in English 0854 GMT 24 Jul 90

[By TASS correspondent Valentin Vasilets]

[Text] Ottawa July 24 TASS—NATO Secretary-General Manfred Woerner stated that his visit to Moscow and talks there confirmed his idea of peace.

In a talk with journalists in Calgary, Woener said he and Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev discussed cuts in weapons and the armed forces.

"Talks on cuts in conventional arms will continue. Following the talks on Moscow. I am confident that we shall have the first results this year," he said.

At the same time Woerner emphasized that the need to maintain NATO will persist despite arms cuts. "Regardless of what happens in the Soviet Union or in the East, they will always have a substantial might. We need a counterbalance to avert the use of force," he said.

Woerner was the first NATO chief to visit Moscow. After visiting Moscow he flew into Calgary to open a NATO conference on reservists.

'International Situation' Program Aired 20 July

LD2007142290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 20 Jul 90

["International Situation—Questions and Answers" program presented by Igor Surguchev, foreign political

commentator of all-Union radio, with Viktor Levin and Sergey Pravdin, identified as 'my colleagues', and V. Kukushkin, international affairs journalist]

[Excerpt] [Surguchev] I will begin our program which, as you know, is by tradition, based on your letters, by talking about an event which took place a few days ago and has not yet been reflected in our mail. I am referring to the working visit to our country by FRG Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl, and the Soviet-West German summit talks which took place.

I have no doubt, esteemed listeners, that you are in general, and on the whole, aware of the results of these talks. Nevertheless, I think it makes sense to speak on this theme while the trail is still warm, as it were, without waiting for your responses, judgements and questions, and all the more so since the event has been assessed throughout the world as extremely important and of vast international significance. And it is difficult not to agree with this assessment.

For, in the center of attention of the participants of the talks were such very topical problems as the unification of Germany, the peaceful future of Europe, and also the further development and enrichment of bilateral relations. By the way, some of these problems are touched upon in the letters from our listeners, and we shall try to reply to them in the course of my conversation with my colleague Viktor Levin, who covered Chancellor Kohl's visit and his talks with Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. Over to you Viktor Nikolayevich.

[Levin] The Soviet-West German summit talks which took place on 15 and 16 July in Moscow and Arkhyz are described as a most important stage on the path toward the unification of the two German states, and as a very important factor facilitating the resolution of the foreign political aspects of the process of unification.

But at the press conference in Zheleznovodsk—by the way, the expression: The spirit of Zheleznovodsk has already appeared—Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Helmut Kohl gave an assessment which shows that steps of fundamental importance have been taken. It is sufficient to say that mutual understanding has been achieved whereby as soon as a united German state is created it will acquire full sovereignty, and all the remaining problems will be resolved on the basis of this, including the problem of its military-political status.

[Surguchev] Viktor Nikolayevich, Comrade (Yansichev) from Chita Oblast, (Leksanov) from Stavropol Kray, and (Yunusov) from Ufa express in their letters the opinion that the changes in Central and East Europe, and primarily the unification of Germany, could create a threat to our security. What could you say about that?

[Levin] Of course, among the Germans, just as, by the way, among any other nation, there are different sorts of people, but today the majority of them are in favor of a future united Germany's being a reliable factor in consolidating Europe, promoting the development of pan-European processes, and serving as a sort of bridge between East and West.

Many years ago the outstanding German writer Thomas Mann said that we want a European Germany, not a German Europe. This thought which has come down through the years, and has come down through the most terrible war unleashed by precisely those Germans who wanted a German Europe, is today acquiring a real outline.

If we use these facts as the basis from which to approach the question of the extent to which the processes of uniting Germany are linked with the problems of ensuring the security of the USSR, then, in my view, one must draw the conclusion that nothing is threatening our security. On the contrary, better prospects than ever before for ensuring it are being opened up.

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, when telling of the results of his talks with Helmut Kohl, noted that both sides set themselves the task of removing the justified fears of both sides.

[Surguchev] On the subject of fears. They really do exist. Please say a bit more about this aspect.

[Levin] I am not going to concentrate attention on the fears of the German side. In the main they come down to the fear that we could put a wrench in the wheel of the process of the unification of the two German states. The understandings give a clear reply.

As far as concerns our sides' fears, there is no secret here.

Despite the fact that the Germans are not the same as they were, they merit trust. Postwar history itself shows very convincingly that both German states have drawn conclusions from the lessons of history, and are striving to make it impossible for the threat of war ever again to come from German soil. And Chancellor Kohl has proclaimed it to be Germany's task to achieve the position that only peace should come from German soil.

But there are psychological aspects connected with the tragic war and it would be incorrect to completely cast aside the thought: Will it not happen that a united Germany will once again become a source of military danger? We cannot do this. And it is this fear that we should speak of first. Yes, much has changed, but all the same, certain guarantees are needed for our fears to be removed. One cannot wipe out and forget what happened in the years of the second world war. Therefore, we are vitally interested and worried about the question of how a united Germany will behave on the military-political level, and what it will be like.

[Surguchev] When the process of uniting the two German states was only just beginning, the USSR frequently stated that it would be unacceptable for a united Germany to participate in NATO, but now, as one can understand from the results of the talks in Moscow and

Arkhyz, we have handed the question of the military-political status of a united Germany to the sovereign discretion of Germany itself. At the same time Chancellor Kohl says quite frankly that a united Germany will be a member of NATO. How is one to understand this?

[Levin] This question must be viewed in the context of all the events which are taking place on the European continent and, in the first place, in the context of the changes taking place in the North Atlantic bloc. We have frequently said that if NATO were to change, then it was very likely that our attitude to the possible membership of that bloc by a united German could undergo a change. And at the start of July, in London, there was a session of the NATO Council at summit level at which a very important decision was made, bearing witness to the start of changes in NATO's military doctrine. A proposal was made there to the Warsaw Pact Organization member states to conclude a nonaggression pact. By the way, at one time the Warsaw Pact Organization put forward such a proposal, but at that time the NATO members did not wish to talk about it. Now they themselves are proposing that we conclude such an agreement. This is evidence of very serious changes.

In the light of these facts our attitude to a possible decision by a united Germany to be a member of NATO of course undergoes changes. Moreover, in Moscow and Arkhyz an understanding was reached that a united Germany would agree to defining by treaty the upper limit of the numerical size of its armed forces. This limit has already been stated: 370,000 personnel. Compared with the total number of servicemen in the two German states, this will mean a reduction of 40-42 percent.

Agreement has been reached that NATO structures will not be extended onto the territory of the present GDR. They will not be extended during the three or four years while our troops will be there, and they will not be extended in the future, either, when Soviet troops leave. They will, of course, leave as, by the way, Comrade (Yunusov) proposes.

But I would like to call your attention, esteemed comrades, to the fact that as yet a not very specific period is being given—three to four years. This can be understood as three, or perhaps four. And I get the impression that this period depends on the progress that is made in the process of creating pan-European security structures. This task has already been set, and work has already begun on resolving this problem. If this proceeds intensively then it is quite possible that our troops will leave after three years. If this process drags on and some additional difficulties arise, then evidently the time that our troops remain will be longer. But I would like to stress once again that the process of the creation of pan-European security structures has already begun, and this removes a large part of our fears.

The world has come to understand that one cannot ensure one's own security at the expense of others' security. The only reliable security is that which is guaranteed to everyone. The outlines of this are already being drawn. Therefore, we can look with optimism on those processes which are proceeding in Europe, including the process of the unification of the two German states.

[Surguchev] Thank you, Viktor Nikolayevich. [passage omitted: Surguchev replies to a question about soviet debts to the United States from World War II lend-lease; Pravdin replies to questions about the international monetary fund; Surguchev recalls the fate of three former politicians in Indonesia, Iran, and Egypt; Kukushkin recounts the progress of the Iran-Iraq peace talks; Surguchev replies to a listener's questions about Israeli-occupied Palestinian territories; Surguchev reports the activities of UNESCO; Surguchev gives brief replies to questions from listeners on minor factual matters]

Changing Face of East-West Ties Analyzed

PM2307131390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Jul 90 Second Edition p 5

[Article by PRAVDA political observer Tomas Kolesnichenko: "Where the Accents Fall"]

[Text] London-Houston-Moscow—Few politicians of late have managed to avoid phrases like "the swift-moving events in the world arena have far outstripped the boldest forecasts...." This is certainly the case. Remember last November, when German unification was first discussed and Margaret Thatcher said that "this process will last 20 years." Today most observers believe it will be completed by the end of this year....

And who would have thought that the NATO secretary general would visit us and invite our leader to speak in the NATO lair, sorry, headquarters in Brussels?

There are many such examples. But somehow I am loath to celebrate. In my view, when events develop ahead of the "schedule" devised by politicians, it means, on the one hand, that either they are in danger of going out of control or they have gone out of control, and, on the other hand, it is evidence of shortcomings in the balanced forecasting of even immediate prospects for the development of the international situation and the absence of appropriate infrastructures and institutions in the new situation in which East-West relations find themselves.

I think it was this "shortage" that determined the content of the intensive political and diplomatic consultations, conferences, and talks which filled the first half of July. It can be said that the 28th CPSU Congress participated in this vigorous collaboration "at a distance." The considerable adjustment of the West's plans and the placing of the emphasis are directly linked to its results.

If one attempts to assess the situation as a whole, the moment has come when the perceptible contours of a new peaceful order not only in Europe, but "on the

separate" planet earth are beginning to emerge, as if out of primeval chaos, a whirl and interplay of doctrines, projects, and theories. I would say that there are also many fragments of the cold war floating around in a very dangerous fashion in this "chaos" that is not exactly "gaseous." Such as, for example, the "star wars" program (the United States plans to spend as much as $55 billion on it by 1992). One could include the modernization of nuclear weapons in Europe, certain NATO military doctrines, and so on and so forth.

However, the shape of the future is becoming ever clearer and it is looking ever brighter and more harmonious. It would appear that the main guidelines are the switch to a qualitatively new concept of coexistence between the different social and political systems, which, as a result of deideologization and the general human approach, are no longer sealed systems kept apart from one another, but are open to wide-ranging collaboration and cooperation.

As a matter of fact, this is the essential substance of the London NATO declaration, the Houston documents of the leaders of the "Seven," and the results of M.S. Gorbachev's talks with FRG Chancellor H. Kohl.

I believe that all these different events have a common denominator—the trust factor. I would say that it is increasingly turning from a psychological criterion into a permanently operating diplomatic criterion. It was this criterion that primarily determined the unprecedented success (to use H. Kohl's words, "breakthrough, fantastic result...") of the talks between the USSR president and the FRG chancellor in Arkhyz. This resort high in the mountains, with its unpronounceable name, will go down in history as as an example of the way mutual trust and personal, "shirtsleeve" diplomacy have led, perhaps, to a new political dawn, providing a way out of the impasse in which the German and effectively the most complex all-European problem of today could have found itself.

A few words in the report from Arkhyz—"during the discussion of the external aspects of German unity, a large degree of mutual understanding was reached on the future military-political status of a united Germany...."—contain, in my view, the most dramatic compromise in our politics in recent years. Indeed, it is hard for us to drop our objections and in fact not impede a united Germany's future membership of NATO, if it so decides. It is hard. Even if the bloc's military structures are not allowed on the territory of the GDR and given other restrictions. After all, the scars of the last war have not yet disappeared. But this is emotion rather than logic. From the viewpoint of logic and common sense it is the only correct decision.

Judge for yourselves.

Let us first trace the FRG's position in London and Houston. Let us add to this its course throughout recent years of reducing nuclear armaments in Europe (at the NATO jubilee session in Brussels last year this all but caused a crisis affecting the whole of the alliance) and Bonn's willingness for long-term political and economic cooperation with us on a treaty basis. During the NATO summit the British paper THE SUNDAY TELEGRAPH assessed this policy as follows: "Germany can secure the dominant position in Europe by means of peace. In a disarmed Europe in which economic might comes to the fore, the German economy will have no equal." In fact, a future Germany prefers to be a military "dwarf" (it plans to reduce its Bundeswehr by nearly one-half), but an economic giant. Finance and economics, rather than the number of bombs, will determine "superpower" status in the future.

Not for nothing is M. Thatcher frightened of this, incidentally. "Nuclear forces," she said at the London conference, "continue to play an extraordinarily important role." Her anxiety is understandable. The shift of emphasis from military force to economic might will inevitably change the essential nature of NATO and the "table of ranks" in it whereby the "less rich" Britain will most likely be overshadowed by Germany.

I will express what is perhaps a controversial idea, but one that is always there: The accent on the economic sphere, the policy of withdrawing or reducing nuclear forces in Europe, in short, Germany's entire current foreign policy course will stimulate, in the event of its joining NATO, the bloc's gradual transformation into a political institution. I will cite an even more categorical pronouncement by the British paper the FINANCIAL TIMES in support of this idea: "The most plausible prognosis is that NATO will follow the Warsaw Pact's example and take the path of disintegration, and evidently nothing that happened at the NATO Council session in London (meaning the assurances of unity, preservation of military doctrines, and so on—T. Kolesnichenko) will be able to slow this process."

There is yet another consideration: Washington's positioning of its "European" accents has radically changed of late. The other day the paper THE TIMES stated with typical British imperturbability: "The NATO leaders are now arranging themselves in a new pecking order. H. Kohl is in supreme favor (as far as Washington is concerned—T. Kolesnichenko)."

So the U.S. "special relationship" with Britain is finally becoming a thing of the past. A new axis is establishing itself: Washington-Bonn. This is now an actual fait accompli, as they say. It is bound to have an effect on the future of the whole of Europe. One wonders now what position the Soviet Union will adopt, given this political setup. Will it isolate itself? Will it think in terms of the past? Or will it make active use of the qualitatively new situation, both on a bilateral basis and in the creation of a new model of a future Europe? The answer, I think, is clear.

Now let us examine the "economic" accents. By and large, it is very difficult to divide global problems into military, political, economic, and so on. In real life they

are all closely and sometimes oddly interwoven. What is being sought, in fact, is the optimum model of mutual relations between East and West in the era following the end of the cold war. At a pinch, one can say that whereas in London they were concerned with ways of solving military-strategic and political problems after the end of the cold war, in Houston what they were examining in this context was economic problems. Therefore, the accents that were placed in 1975 in Rambouillet, at the first conference of the seven "richest" countries of the West, are as different from those that were placed recently in Houston as chalk is from cheese. Of course—and one must not exaggerate here—"fraternity" is still lacking and it is unlikely to exist ever. Even within the "seven," not to mention the entire West-East sphere. But changes, radical ones indeed, are in evidence. THE WASHINGTON POST, for example, considers that the broad dialogue on political, strategic, economic problems and problems of the environment that was conducted in Houston at the conference of the seven major industrially developed countries of the West "will also very possibly be a supreme global command, involving not only the Western powers, but the Soviet Union and China...." In Rambouillet, at the height of the cold war, such an idea would have been unthinkable. Indeed, such a "command" could in principle replace both the Warsaw Pact and NATO. And why not?

Thinking about the unthinkable is perhaps becoming a norm of international politics. Formerly, the "unthinkable" meant nuclear armageddon, but now it means the most incredible forms of cooperation between us and the West, including military cooperation. Anyway, that is exactly how it should be in the "era of lasting peace" we are now entering. And its chief characteristic will obviously be the factor of stability. Already it is acquiring extraordinary significance.

This is the very accent that has now been placed in Paris, at the third meeting of foreign ministers in accordance with the "two-plus-four" formula. It is not only a matter of a specific and final solution of the question of the Polish-German border. The principle of European stability—inviolability of postwar borders—laid down in the Helsinki accords and, prior to that, in Yalta and Potsdam has effectively been confirmed. The edifice of European security has been built "brick by brick." And any attempt to remove one of them, say, for instance, Yalta, is highly dangerous. Germany's triumph this time must be a triumph for the whole of Europe, the guarantee of its stability.

This is the key word for us, too. I think that the West now views economic (and, indeed, political) links with our country from the standpoint of stability. And it is a matter not so much of short-term injections of money into our economy—they are not much use in themselves—as of long-term mutually advantageous cooperation and our economy's involvement in world economic links. From this viewpoint, visits to us by Western economic experts, particularly by Delors, the "tsar of Europe," as he is known, acquire special significance. After all, the switch to a market economy is not a stroll along the Nevskiy Prospekt. One has to know all the "ruts" and "potholes" and be able to see exactly where the "ditch" is. An unprejudiced, objective assessment of the situation will help us make the transition.

That is why the accents that were placed in London and Houston, in NATO, in the EEC, in the FRG, and so on depended and will continue to depend on those that are currently being placed in Moscow. This means that we must not rock our society "left" and "right," but strengthen the course of further democratization, humanization, and triumph of human values.

United States & Canada

Bush Argues for Peace Through Strength

LD2307214790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Jul 90 First Edition p 6

[Commentary by Gennadiy Vasilyev under the rubric "Observer's Opinion": "When They 'Wet the Head' of the Aircraft Carrier"]

[Text] We have somehow become used to the far-reaching, positive changes taking place in the world, and to the fact that the "enemy image" is receding into the past, that East-West collaboration is being built, and that the process of cuts in arms and armed forces is developing successfully. We see all this as a historic change of direction in the very philosophy of international relations, and in our understanding of the basis on which peace and prosperity can and must be founded. But all is not so simple nowadays. Our progressive forward movement is not without zigzags and repetitions of the past.

I am referring to the speech by U.S. President G. Bush at the ceremony to launch the new nuclear aircraft carrier George Washington onto the waves at the shipyard in Newport News (State of Virginia). He said that "even today, aircraft carriers are an inalienable part of the American arsenal: They ensure the spread of our might and the preservation of peace." "We have not yet entered the era of eternal peace," the President continued. "American might is still the force in the world that has the most paramount importance for safeguarding freedom."

Bush reminded his audience of the words of the person who this latest aircraft carrier is named for: George Washington. "Be ready for war: That is one of the most effective ways to preserve peace."

I will be frank—this speech was couched in a tone that is now unusual. However, the phraseology is familiar, even standard for America. One could say it is the traditional Republican theme of "peace from a position of strength," to which Washington has often resorted when it has needed to achieve certain objectives: To push through an inflated military budget or promote the election of the necessary people to Congress. Familiar words. But are they appropriate today?

I think it is impossible to disagree with the opinion of those political observers who link these words and this tone to the election campaign under way in the United States. Congress is being reelected this year—the entire House of Representatives and one-third of Senate. For whatever its reasons, the Republican leadership has evidently decided to outflank its Democratic rivals from the right by resorting to the phraseology of force, and by playing on Americans' "superpatriotism." Time will tell whether this will help them to retain or even increase their seats on Capitol Hill, where increasingly broad demands are being made to make fuller use of the "peace dividend" and more decisively reduce the military budget. But the words spoken by the U.S. President not only carry across America: They carry across the whole world. What would people say abroad if the Soviet leadership started using the language of military confrontation in order to "indulge" our country's extreme conservatives?

As far as George Washington's statement is concerned, it was probably right in those years when the American colonies, free of British domination, were waging a struggle for their independence.

Gorbachev Greets Goodwill Games in Seattle

LD2207133690 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1200 GMT 22 Jul 90

[Message by M.S. Gorbachev to Goodwill Games in Seattle, read by Nikolay Rusak, official of the USSR Committee for Physical Culture and Sport, on 21 July; from the "Television News Service" program—recorded]

[Text] I cordially greet all of you. Four years ago Moscow received the initiators and first participants of the games. The relay baton has now passed to Seattle. Let this be a handshake across the ocean.

The Goodwill Games are the fruit of people's diplomacy which has imparted to sport—a longstanding and universal means of human contact—a new aspect reflecting the profound and beneficial changes throughout the whole of world development.

I highly appreciate your contribution to the international sports movement and to friendship between the peoples of different countries.
[Signed] Mikhail Gorbachev [applause]

Baker's Plan for Expert Economic Aid Viewed

PM2307130390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Jul 90 Morning Edition p 1

[Dispatch by IZVESTIYA correspondent V. Nadein: "U.S. Experts Ready To Help"]

[Text] Washington—The United States is ready to give the Soviet Union expert assistance in making the transition to a market model of the economy and also in regularizing the disordered consumer goods market. U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker has put a list of proposals to USSR Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze, but they are not final proposals. The Soviet Union has a right to reject the program in full or in part, while it cannot be ruled out that the United States might add new points to it.

Although formally this proposal fulfills the accords reached during the Malta meeting of M.S. Gorbachev and G. Bush, it sheds additional light on the recently concluded Houston conference, where the leaders of seven of the world's most powerful capitalist states were meeting.

Against the background of the vigorous actions by FRG Chancellor H. Kohl and French President F. Mitterrand in favor of giving immediate and direct economic aid to perestroyka in the Soviet Union, many people evaluated the restrained U.S. stance as an attempt to totally avoid giving material support for the democratic changes in the USSR.

A number of weighty circumstances favored such an interpretation. During the Soviet president's recent visit to the United States, the U.S. side raised the situation around Lithuania as the chief obstacle to full-value trade ties. Lithuania was no longer mentioned in Houston, although new objections did appear: the USSR's big spending on arms and its aid for Cuba. However, many commentators saw as the main reason the financial difficulties of the United States itself, where 13 states were recently deemed to have entered a period of recession.

J. Baker's proposals make it possible to assess more accurately the intentions of the U.S. administration. It is perfectly obvious that it is really guided by the point which President Bush has made repeatedly: The success of perestroyka in the USSR is important to the whole world and, consequently, to the United States itself. However, under conditions when elements of the edict system continue to predominate in the Soviet economy, assistance in terms of money and goods could put the brakes on decisive measures to make the switch to market relations.

Assessing the list of proposals, which will finally be discussed in August in Irkutsk, where the next meeting of the two foreign policy departments' leaders is planned, commentators here cite a well-known aphorism. It runs as follows: If you give a starving man a fish, you will feed him on one occasion. But if you teach him to catch fish, he will feed himself all his life.

The list of means and methods of "catching fish" today includes the following:

1. Sending to the USSR a group of U.S. experts who will help the Soviet side to improve the network for the delivery of goods to the consumer. Here an extremely low assessment is made of this network's present potential, since even food and goods purchased in the West frequently spend six months traveling about in railcars and ships until they reach the counters.

2. Drawing up proposals for the introduction of a correctly functioning banking system into Soviet practice.

3. A group of experts of the Department of Housing and Urban Development will draw up plans to comprehensively ensure the construction of private housing. THE NEW YORK TIMES correspondent T. Friedman recalls in this connection that when M.S. Gorbachev was overflying the suburbs of Washington on his way to Camp David last June, he made very detailed inquiries about the cost of the houses over which his helicopter was flying and about forms of ownership.

4. Organizing training courses in our country to improve the qualifications of Soviet managers.

5. Helping to draw up the principles of efficient tax administration. The Americans have tremendous experience with this, and familiarization with it will make it possible to avoid extremes when, on the one hand, taxes stifle enterprises and, on the other, the state is not able to efficiently keep track of the profits of energetically operating enterprises.

Although all these points do not envisage direct capital investments, they could have a weighty effect. The United States has demonstrated the effectiveness of its expertise, which has made a decisive contribution to the development of such now flourishing economies as those of Japan, West Germany, and South Korea.

However, commentators also note the important fact that in the said countries, the Americans were not only advisers in the postwar period but also direct managers. But in this case our side might reject out of political considerations, let us say, even those measures which experts consider to be of substantial importance. Baker's package, for example, unambiguously points out that business contacts are planned not only with representatives of state establishments but also with forces that are considered opposition forces.

Such an approach by the U.S. administration could also elicit serious support among Washington legislators. However, there are many skeptics among U.S. politicians, even those who are sincerely sympathetic to the democratic processes in the USSR. Citing the failures of past attempts made by one-off expert groups, skeptics see the blank unreceptiveness of many current Soviet administrators to the basic requirements of a market economy as the reason for the failures.

This time, according to reports in THE NEW YORK TIMES, the Soviet foreign minister expressed the conviction that the inertia of conservative administrators will not serve as a serious obstacle to expedient innovations.

Supreme Soviet Delegation Meets Congressmen

LD1907103190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0352 GMT 19 Jul 90

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Matyash]

[Text] Washington, 19 Jul (TASS)—A group of USSR Supreme Soviet deputies headed by A. Veprev, chairman of the Supreme Soviet Committee on Agrarian Matters and Food, is here at the invitation of the U.S. Congress. In Washington the Soviet members of parliament had business meetings on Capitol Hill with George Mitchell, leader of the Democratic majority in the Senate; Kika de la Garza, chairman of the House of Representatives Agriculture Committee, and Carla Hills, U.S. trade representative. There were also conversations with Richard McCormick, assistant U.S. secretary of state for the

economy, and Cooper Evans, special assistant to the President for agricultural trade and food assistance, concerned with the problems of expanding economic cooperation between the two countries.

The U.S. side, A. Veprev told the TASS correspondent, has shown great interest in the political and socioeconomic processes taking place in the USSR. They discussed in detail the problems and potential of further development of Soviet-U.S. cooperation in agriculture. Senator Mitchell said, specifically, that the United States sincerely supports perestroyka in the USSR and wishes the Soviet people prosperity and success. In the course of the Washington conversations a common desire was also demonstrated for broadening contacts through parliamentary channels between the USSR Supreme Soviet and the U.S. Congress.

During a week-long tour of the United States the Soviet members of parliament specializing in agriculture will visit a major poultry farming complex in Salisbury, not far from the U.S. capital, agricultural research complexes in Belstville and Saint Louis, the National Center for Trade in Agricultural Equipment in Troy and the headquarters of the world-famous Monsanto company, a leading biotechnology research firm.

A Soviet-U.S. seminar on agricultural problems, to be held in the state of Illinios—a major U.S. agricultural and industrial center—will be an important part of the trip.

Deputy Foreign Minister Receives U.S. Official

LD1907144190 Moscow TASS in English 1430 GMT 19 Jul 90

[Text] Moscow July 19 TASS—Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Viktor Karpov today received John Hawes, a ranking U.S. State Department official leading the American delegation to the "Open Skies" conference.

They held a detailed discussion of issues connected with working out accords at the conference.

Karpov and Hawes agreed on further Soviet-U.S. consultations in the run-up to the next stage of the conference, the timeframe of which has yet to be decided.

China

More on PRC's Congress Leader's Visit

OW2307045590 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0100 GMT 20 Jul 90

[From "Current Events and Commentaries" program]

[Text] The delegation led by Peng Chong, vice chairman of the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress [NPC], arrived in the Soviet Union on 19 July for a formal, friendly visit at the invitation of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR. Peng Chong was interviewed by our station reporter (Matsenko) at Sheremetyevo airport.

[Begin Peng Chong recording] I am very happy to have this opportunity to come to the Soviet Union and to be able to meet many leading comrades, people and comrades at various levels. Today, we would like to thank our comrade and deputy chairman of the Soviet of the Union of the USSR Supreme Soviet and other comrades who have come to the airport to greet us. We are very grateful. On behalf of the delegation of the Chinese NPC, I convey the good wishes of the people of China to the people of the Soviet Union. Just now a reporter has asked about the purpose this delegation's visit. The purpose is very clear; namely, this visit is in response to the visit made last year by Comrade Lukyanov to the Chinese NPC, and so our visit is a return visit after that. The purpose is to personally understand, strengthen and develop the friendly cooperation between the two parliaments and the people of the two countries. I believe that with the careful and thoughtful arrangement by the USSR Supreme Soviet, this visit of ours will be a success. [end recording]

The current visit will last till 26 July. The schedule of the visit is very tight. On Friday and Saturday, the Chinese guests will get to know the work of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and meet and talk to the various committees and leaders of the Soviet parliament. The delegation will also visit a health resort at Yalta and Leningrad, get to know the work of the local Soviets, and visit industrial and agricultural enterprises, as well as scenic spots and historical sites. On the last day, the delegation will visit and see the work and life of Soviet cosmonauts.

Laptev Meets PRC Delegation

PM2307132990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Jul 90 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report under general heading: "Official Reports"]

[Text] The Soviet Union is living through a historic moment in its history. The processes of perestroyka and the democratization and renewal of socialist society have enlisted the broad working masses to political life. This was stated 20 July at a talk in the USSR Supreme Soviet with a delegation from the PRC's National People's Congress [NPC] headed by Peng Chong, vice chairman of the NPC Standing Committee and chief of the NPC Standing Committee Secretariat. The guests have come to our country on an official visit at the invitation of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

A.A. Ananyev, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for International Affairs, described the results of the 28th CPSU Congress, which confirmed the basic avenues of perestroyka and the course toward the party's renewal.

At the guests' request the committee deputy chairman described the work of the new Soviet parliament and its committees and commissions.

The rapid growth of Soviet-Chinese interstate contacts, economic ties, and border and exchange trade makes it possible to speak of considerable reserves for bilateral relations. This was stated by I.D. Laptev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet's Soviet of the Union, who met with the PRC guests the same day.

Compromise Needed to Reduce Troops on Border

OW2307202590 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0600 GMT 17 Jul 90

[Text] Dear listeners, you are listening to the "Scope" program. There is some good news about the 7,500-km Soviet-Chinese border, the longest boundary between two countries in the world. The fourth negotiations of Soviet-Chinese diplomatic and military experts has decided on the date for future talks on reducing Armed Forces along this boundary. The talks will begin in Moscow this autumn. Our station reporter on diplomatic affairs talked with (Chiliyev), leader of the USSR experts group.

[(Chiliyev) is briefly heard, speaking in Russian, fading into Mandarin translation] The Soviet diplomat pointed out that negotiations would not be easy, because they would involve the most delicate and the most sensitive aspect of activities, namely, the military aspect. The two countries have been under military and political confrontations for decades. The last session of finalizing issues on organizations and procedures in preparation for future talks indicated that both sides were willing to compromise so as to seek and arrive at a plan acceptable to both.

'Sovereignty, Equality' Needed for PRC Trade

OW2407062090 Moscow in Mandarin to Southeast Asia 1100 GMT 23 Jul 90

[Text] The value of Soviet-Chinese trade surpassed 6 billion Swiss francs in 1989, an increase of 30 percent over 1988. Yao Yilin, vice premier of the Chinese State Council, noted this fact after signing the memorandum pertaining to the fifth meeting of the Soviet-Chinese Economic, Trade, Scientific and Technological Cooperation Committee. He stressed that the normalization of Soviet-Chinese relations last year was the starting point of a new period of trade expansion between the two countries. In this connection, our station observer Alekseyev writes:

As everyone knows, Gorbachev's visit to China last year signaled the complete normalization of Soviet-Chinese relations and facilitated the expansion of economic and trade relations between the two countries. From 1981-88, the volume of Soviet-China trade grew ninefold. Perhaps some explanation of significance of normalized Soviet-Chinese relations for trade is in order.

The development of economic and trade relations between nations does not occur in isolation. To a great extent, it depends on the nature of political relations between two countries, especially the stability and prospects of these political relations. The complete normalization of ties in 1989 laid the foundation and offered long-term prospects for these relations. I believe this is mainly because the two sides have learned the lessons of the past and have abandoned their principles of the 1950's. In those days, the precondition for cooperation in any sphere was unanimity on all domestic and foreign policies.

Older listeners will remember the consequences of such a dogmatic stance. The difference in the late 1950's became the reason for the decreased contacts between the two countries, including that of economic and trade relations.

I think that changes today do not signal the absence of difference, now or in the future, between the Soviet Union and China, for it is naive to assume that the interests of big countries like the Soviet Union and China will always be similar. However, today both Moscow and Beijing no longer feel uneasy over this. No matter what happens, the two countries believe that difference in certain spheres is no reason for abandoning cooperation, because this cooperation is based on mutual interests. In other words, a practical position based on realities and healthy ideas has replaced that of ideologies.

The important thing is that the present stage of Soviet-Chinese is based on the solid foundation of the five principles of peaceful coexistence. They reliably guarantee the sovereignty and interests of each side and eliminate every trace of inequality. This is very important to cooperation between the two countries, including the steady expansion of bilateral trade.

Northeast Asia

Conference on Japanese Business Ties Held

OW2307061390 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1000 GMT 7 Jul 90

[From the "Far East News" program]

[Excerpts] The third conference of representatives of cooperatives and business circles from the Soviet Far East and Siberia and Hokkaido was held in Khabarovsk city in late June under the joint sponsorship of the Soviet Tsentrosoyuz [Central Union of Consumers' Cooperatives] and the Hokkaido Japan-USSR Trade Association [JUTA]. Present at the conference from the Soviet side were representatives from the Tsentrosoyuz, the Russian Republic's Union of Consumers' Cooperatives [RUCC], and organizations of the Soviet Far Eastern and Siberian consumers' cooperatives as well as representatives from Khabarovsk and Sakhalin oblast central executive committees, and from the Japanese side, representatives

from Hokkaido JUTA, Hokkaido Federation of Agricultural Cooperatives, Federation of Timber Processing Cooperatives, and other business and social organizations. In total, about 100 representatives from the both sides attended the conference.

In his greetings to the plenary session of the conference, RUCC Chairman and Soviet delegation leader (Yamakov) said: Our conference has become a good tradition. However, this cannot be achieved without great efforts on the part of our Japanese partners. He remarked:

[Begin (Yamakov) recording, in Russian fading into Japanese translation] Friendly relations and business cooperation between Soviet cooperatives, Hokkaido JUTA, and the Hokkaido organization of regional cooperatives have their own independent tradition and long history and have brought favorable economic results. At the same time, however, I would like to point out that we have not fully made use of great potentials of our both sides in promoting trade and economic cooperation. This is particularly true with the Soviet Far Eastern organizations of cooperatives. On this occasion, I would like to inform you with pleasure that the Association of Business Cooperation with Japan was inaugurated under the government instructions in the Soviet Union last May. The RUCC is a member of this association. [passage omitted]

Concerning relations between Hokkaido and Soviet Far Eastern and Siberian cooperatives, I must point out that the number of those organizations that want to take part in such cooperation has increased as compared with the number at the last conference. Today, unions of consumers' cooperatives in Novosibirsk, Omsk, Altai, Chita, Yakult, and Irkutsk have indicated great interest in this concern. Various consumers' cooperatives in Siberia have started exporting coal to Japan through the JUTA since last year. In particular, I would like to mention the trade fairs held in the past few years. We feel that such trade fairs are good chances for further promoting current relations in exchanges, opening up new fields, and expanding individual contacts. [passage omitted]

Respectable representatives, our business cooperation is not so long when viewed from historical standpoint. In this connection, it is all the more pleasant to notice that our fields in cooperation has been expanded constantly and that new types of cooperation has emerged. For example, let us cite tourism. The Soviet-Japanese Tourism Association has been established for the purpose of developing resort tourist facilities mainly in the Soviet Far Eastern oblasts and Siberia. The Tsentrosoyuz and the JUTA are among the sponsors of this association. [passage omitted]

I am convinced that this conference will settle accumulated pending issues, establish new contacts, and further promote current exchanges so that our cooperation will be expanded and promotion of friendship between the Soviet and Japanese peoples will be further developed and strengthend. [end recording]

This is what Chairman (Yamakov) of the Russian Republic's Union of Consumers' Cooperatives, has said.

The topics for discussion at the plenary session as well as at panel discussions at the conference included the strengthening of friendship, good-neighborliness, and cooperative relations in the Far East; expansion of regional cooperation between the Soviet Far East and Siberia and Hokkaido; and the strengthening of economic cooperation and exchanges between Soviet and Japanese cooperatives.

Sakhalin-Hokkaido Air Link Inaugurated

LD1907172290 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1240 GMT 19 Jul 90

[Text] There is now a direct airlink between Sakhalin and Hokkaido. The flight takes two hours. The service was inaugurated today by a Tu-154 flying from Hakodate to Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk. Aboard the charter flight were 150 representatives of the Japan-USSR society, bringing doves of peace.

DPRK Illegal Fishing Boat Dispute Continues

PM1807115190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Jul 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Report by V. Remizov: "Dispute Over, Final Decision Ahead"]

[Text] As already reported in IZVESTIYA (Nos. 187 and 189), in the second half of May this year Soviet Far Eastern fishery protection agencies arrested 12 fishing boats belonging to the DPRK "Von-Yang" company for illegally fishing for Soviet salmon.

The evidence—more than 500 tonnes of red fish—was found in the hold. The damage stands at R5 million. The protracted investigation into this case of large-scale international poaching has now been completed. On 11 July, the Korean side gave guarantees that it would pay a surety of $3 million so that the arrested vessels can be immediately released.

At a news conference given in this connection by the USSR Ministry of the Fishing Industry, Deputy Minister V. Zilanov said that the Korean side had fully admitted the breach of the law. Further investigation into the case will be conducted in line with Soviet legislation and accords reached. We have also been promised that every measure will be taken to compensate for the damage.

The length of the investigation into this case is explained by the sides' different interpretations of the corresponding provisions of the UN Convention on Maritime Law and existing bilateral accords.

Decision in Case Appealed

PM1807154390 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 14 Jul 90 Second Edition p 6

[Report by KRASNAYA ZVEZDA correspondent Captain S. Anisko: "After the Briefing: ...Three Million at the Moment"]

[Text] KRASNAYA ZVEZDA already reported that coast guard and fisheries' protection ships had detained ships of the DPRK "Von Yang" Company, which were involved in illegal salmon fishing in the northern area of the Pacific Ocean.

The incident was settled with mutual goodwill, it seemed. V. Zilanov, the country's deputy minister of the fish industry, reported this to journalists 13 July.

On 11 July the Korean side, in complete accordance with Soviet legislation, guaranteed that it would stand surety for U.S. $3 million so as to have the detained ships released straight away.

But the Far East fisheries' protection organs are not satisfied with the decision of the Nakhodka City Court which, in their opinion, groundlessly dismissed the case that was filed. They appealed to the kray court to have the decision reviewed. In their appeal claim, the organs of the Main Administration for the Protection and Reproduction of Fish Reserves and Regulation of Fishing demanded the imposition of a fine of 100,000 rubles [R] on each vessel, confiscation of the fishing equipment and the catch, and compensation for the damage incurred.

"Is Vyacheslav Konstantinovich Zilanov personally satisfied with today's results in the resolution of the conflict?", I asked the deputy minister. And he answered bluntly:

"We acted in strict accordance with our laws and the relevant UN Convention on Maritime Law. I believe that the decision that has been made now is based on the sides' mutual understanding. Nonetheless, I am still waiting for the Vladivostok court. I do not consider the decision of the Nakhodka court to be correct."

Ministry Issues Statement

LD2407084890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0330 GMT 24 Jul 90

[Text] The USSR Ministry of Fish Industry has given a reply to the USSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting regarding a report in the "Vremya" program on an incident which occurred in April, connected with the arrest of 12 ships belonging to the DPRK by USSR fish protection bodies and border troops. They had been engaged in poaching inside the 200-mile economic zone of the Soviet Union. A report dated 11 July says that the Korean side has provided guarantees to put down a security of $3 million for the purpose of immediatley releasing the arrested ships, which was done 12-13 July. The Korean side has fully admitted the violation, made its apologies, given an assurance that it will not permit such cases in future, and measures will be taken against the offenders in this case for full reimbursement of the losses inflicted by them on Soviet salmon stocks.

Further investigation of this incident is being carried out jointly by the main administration for the protection of fish stocks and the regulation of fishing of the USSR Ministry of Fish Industry, and the corresponding organs of the DPRK. The length of time it took to look into this matter, the reply notes was caused by the sides' differing interpretations of the relevant provisions in the UN convention on maritime law and of existing bilateral accords.

Near East & South Asia

More on Indian Prime Minister Singh's Visit

Singh Interviewed

PM2307104590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Jul 90 First Edition pp 1, 5

[Interview with Indian Prime Minister Vishwanath Pratap Singh in Delhi by own correspondent I. Sharov, APN correspondent A. Zheleznov, and TASS correspondent M. Kapustin; date of interview not stated: "Deep Roots"]

[Text] Delhi—[PRAVDA] What in your opinion is the present level of Soviet-Indian relations and what are the prospects for their development?

[Singh] In assessing Soviet-Indian relations it is essential to be clearly aware of one very important circumstance: That is the relations of one people with another people. A historical tradition of friendship and firm relations devoid of considerations of immediate advantage or changeability is inherent in them. For the Indian people these relations have been embodied in living reality and therefore Soviet-Indian friendship extends from the capitals to the most remote villages. It is a friendship which took root long ago. That is why the question of what the present level of Soviet-Indian relations is can scarcely arise. Stability—that is their main content.

But there are many changes taking place in the world largely thanks to the exceptionally bold initiatives of USSR President M.S. Gorbachev. That is why the leaders need to meet to compare their views. It is in this context that I view my visit to the USSR in order to strengthen our friendship at the political level and lend impetus to cooperation in various fields and, of course, discuss all these questions with the USSR president. I need meetings with him. It is with this thought that I am setting off for the Soviet Union. Our friendship rests on a very firm foundation. I expect that in the next few years we will come out with new initiatives together.

[PRAVDA] Your visit is taking place soon after the very important 28th CPSU Congress. What do you think of the results of this forum?

[Singh] The congress demonstrated decisive approval for M.S. Gorbachev's position and his perspicacity and political wisdom and also adherence to the path he has chosen. It is very important to have a clear idea of the aims proclaimed to the whole world. They exert profound influence on the entire international community. The congress also demonstrated that we can gradually make headway and achieve the goals we have set on the basis of a real understanding of things. I think that is the basic result of the congress.

[PRAVDA] What is your assessment of the policy of perestroyka and glasnost in the Soviet Union?

[Singh] Yes, of course as a whole we welcome it. Essentially M.S. Gorbachev has accepted the challenge of history. The initiatives he puts forward in the international arena affect very important problems like disarmament, the reduction of nuclear arms, and confidence building.

[PRAVDA] In your opinion, what influence can the changes taking place in the USSR and the world as a whole exert on the state of Soviet-Indian economic cooperation?

[Singh] Great influence. We now have very fruitful cooperation in the field of the economy and I am convinced that new opportunities and paths and forms of collaboration will open up. And that is perfectly natural. It is precisely to this question that I shall pay paramount attention during my visit. I hope to obtain first hand information on various aspects of your country's life. We look with hope at the prospects for even more fruitful cooperation.

[PRAVDA] The Soviet Union is following attentively the development of the situation in the South Asian region and your government's efforts to improve relations with neighboring countries. Nonetheless the problems remain for the time being. What is being done and what has already been done to resolve them?

[Singh] During the election campaign relations with neighboring countries were one of the priority points of the National Front program. And we achieved certain successes with some of our neighbors. We not only succeeded in eliminating existing problems but also in beginning a course toward positive cooperation with Nepal. We opened dialogue in a spirit of benevolence with the PRC. Relations with Bangladesh have improved.

Pakistan is the sole sorry exception. Relations with it have deteriorated but we advocate good relations with that country. We want peace and have unilaterally withdrawn our troops and tanks from the Mahajan testing range (Rajasthan state) over which there has been so much noise in Pakistan. We also suggested a package of confidence-building measures leading to dialogue and talks. And I hope that a sense of realism will prevail in this question.

As for Afghanistan, the settlement of the conflict in that country cannot be achieved through violence and outside interference. If these conditions are observed, it is possible to expect substantial positive advances in the solution of this problem.

[PRAVDA] For many years India has played a decisive role in the Nonaligned Movement. What is your opinion of this movement's main tasks at the present stage?

[Singh] Today the Nonaligned Movement is as topical as ever. Look: After all we are witnessing the triumph of the concept of nonviolence and in general the world is moving toward nonalignment. Considerable credit in strengthening this tendency goes to President Gorbachev. But the developing countries' problems remain unchanged. And we will have to elaborate new initiatives for their joint solution. But the basic "Pancha Shila" principles—noninterference in each other's internal affairs and mutual respect—must be preserved.

There are also still major local conflicts which should be ended and, finally, there is one problem which is in need of urgent solution—poverty.

[PRAVDA] The National front government recently overcame a crisis. What is your assessment of the political situation in the country?

[Singh] Actually, having formed our party we issued a serious challenge to our political opponents. The Janata Dal party was formed relatively recently as a result of the merging of four different groupings. While other parties have a long history—for instance, the congress has already celebrated its centenary while the Communist Party, like the Bharatiya Janata Party, emerged before the country acquired independence.

However that may be, we united when people almost everywhere doubted our viability. They said that we would be unable to prepare for the elections and put forward candidates. We coped with that task and won the elections. Then they began to say: You will be unable to form a government. But we created a government, and friendly parties supported us. Success has attended us. You must understand that democratic collaboration is the mechanism for our functioning. We are a democratic country and we have the desire, the means, and the opportunity to overcome crises.

The people have given us a mandate to rule the country for the first time at the parliamentary elections and then confirmed this mandate at the elections to the states' legislative assemblies. We enjoy the people's trust, and that is a guarantee of our stability.

[PRAVDA] What are the main problems facing the National Front government?

[Singh] Of course, the problems of the states of Jammu and Kashmir and the Punjab and the rise in prices. Those are the three main elements, otherwise the government is functioning normally. But to that is added the balance of payments deficit and also tasks of development, the elimination of poverty and unemployment, and the problems of the neediest strata of society.

[PRAVDA] You are going to the Soviet Union after an interval of many years. What are your feelings?

[Singh] You know, I have an emotional attachment to the Soviet Union. When I was still quite young I visited your country for the first time, in 1955, after the World Festival of Youth and Students in Warsaw. I traveled from Brest to the border with China n the Trans-Siberian railway. It was then that I was able to feel the warmth of Soviet people's attitude toward India. That helped me personally to understand better the image of Jawaharlal Nehru and it made such a strong impression on me that under the impression of my trip to the USSR I soon joined the ranks of the Indian National Congress.

Later I visited your country as minister of trade but I did not manage to see much during that trip. In talks with Soviet leaders I sensed what feelings they have for India. And that has left a deep impression, like those changes which at the time were only being conceived but are now being implemented.

Constitutes First Summit-Level Meeting

BK2307080490 Delhi Domestic Service in English 0730 GMT 23 Jul 90

[Text] The prime minister, Mr. Vishwanath Pratap Singh, has arrived in Moscow on a four-day official visit to the Soviet Union. He was received at the airport by the Soviet prime minister, Mr. Ryzhkov, and other dignitaries. The prime minister is scheduled to meet Mr. Gorbachev during the day. The prime minister is accompanied by a high-level delegation which includes the finance minister, Professor Madhu Dandavate; the external affairs minister, Mr. I.K. Gujral; and the commerce minister, Mr. Arun Nehru. Senior officials in the delegation include the principal secretary to the prime minister, the finance secretary, the defense secretary, the foreign secretary, and the information adviser to the prime minister.

This is the prime minister's first summit-level contact with the Soviet president, Mr. Gorbachev, for further strengthening of bilateral relations and exchange of views on global issues. The wide-ranging discussions will include trade and economic relations and Pakistan's abetment of secessionists in Jammu and Kashmir.

Earlier, before his departure from Delhi, the prime minister told newsmen that his talks in Moscow will provide him of an opportunity to establish rapport with President Gorbachev who, he said, is taking revolutionary steps following perestroyka and glasnost.

Ryzhkov Heads First Round of Talks With Singh

BK2307145990 Delhi Domestic Service in English 1230 GMT 23 Jul 90

[Text] The first round of delegation-level talks between India and the Soviet Union was held in Moscow today. The Indian delegation was led by the prime minister, Mr. Vishwanath Pratap Singh, while the Soviet delegation was headed by Prime Minister Ryzhkov. The three union ministers—Professor Madhu Dandavate, Mr. Arun Nehru, and Mr. I.K. Gujral—were also present at the talks.

Our special correspondent Devprasad Das understands that the talks covered a wide range of subjects of global interest as well of interest to the Indian subcontinent. Among the international subjects, the recent Bush-Gorbachev summit and the Soviet perception of the changing strategy in East European countries figured.

Mr. V.P. Singh is understood to have briefed the Soviet leaders on Pakistan's direct involvement with subversive elements in Jammu and Kashmir. He also informed about India's efforts to normalize relations with China.

Our correspondent reports that economic matters concerning bilateral trade also figured in the talks.

Earlier, on arrival, the prime minister was received at the airport by his Soviet counterpart Mr. Ryzhkov. The prime minister was cordially received by the Soviet president, Mr. Gorbachev, during a official reception at the Kremlin. Mr. Singh and Mr. Gorbachev had a brief meeting immediately after Mr. Singh's arrival at the Kremlin.

Mr. Singh laid a wreath at the tomb of Vladimir Lenin in the Red Square and at the Memorial of Unknown Soldier alongside the Kremlin. Mr. Gorbachev will host a state banquet in honor of the visiting prime minister tonight.

Trade, Economic Prospects Viewed

LD2307123990 Moscow TASS in English 1234 GMT 23 Jul 90

[Text] Moscow July 23 TASS—Gennadiy Semenilkov, deputy head of the main department for economic relations with Asian countries of the USSR Ministry for Foreign Economic Relations, referred to trade-and-economic relations between the Soviet Union and India as "active and developing".

Speaking about trade prospects for 1990, he told TASS that the purchase of consumer goods from India (knitwear, sewn goods, medicines, perfumeries and cosmetics) will grow by almost 50 percent.

"Detergents will continue to be imported in large amounts. Purchases of tea, coffee, spices, and other traditional Indian commodities will remain at high level,

and the delivery of engineering products, including hi-tech electronic and medical equipment, to the USSR will grow.

"In the Soviet export programme, provision is made to boost the delivery of complete plants and some types of raw materials (copper, potassium fertilisers).

"A complex situation is taking shape in the delivery of a number of Soviet staple export commodities to India," Semenilkov pointed out.

"In order to determine ways to boost the delivery of engineering products, the USSR Chamber of Commerce and Industry and other Soviet organisations are planning to receive a widely-representative delegation from the Indian business community in August-September," he said.

Although India remains one of the Soviet Union's major foreign-trading partners—this year's turnover in trade between the two countries will run at 8,800 crore (88 billion) rupees—the Soviet expert said that the economic situation in the two countries will make the Soviet Union and India pay serious attention to new forms of cooperation.

This will be necessary, he said, "because in the fields of traditional goods exchanges the two sides have approached the ceiling in the delivery of goods."

Semenilkov favoured expanding co-production arrangements and active participation by the two sides' banks in financing foreign trade.

Gorbachev, Singh Sign Statement of Cooperation

LD2307162290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 23 Jul 90

[Excerpts] Vishwanath Pratap Singh, prime minister of the Republic of India, arrived in Moscow today on an official friendly visit at the invitation of the Soviet leadership. Our special correspondent Dmitriy Morozov reports:

[Morozov] [passage omitted] Meetings with Soviet leaders and the continuation of talks are planned for tomorrow. However, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and the prime minister of India have already signed a Soviet-Indian statement in which they solemnly confirm mutual adherence to building a world free of nuclear weapons and violence, in accordance with the principles of the Delhi Declaration, which reflect the aspirations of states and peoples of all continents. The statement will be published in full in the newspapers. [passage omitted]

[Announcer] We have just received a report that an intergovernmental agreement has also been signed on cooperation in the field of information. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and other participants in the Soviet-Indian talks were present at the ceremony.

'Text' of Joint Statement

LD2407082290 Moscow TASS in English 0804 GMT 24 Jul 90

[Text] Moscow July 24 TASS—Follows full text of Soviet-Indian statement signed here on Monday:

"India and the Soviet Union solemnly reaffirm their mutual commitment to building a nuclear-weapon-free and non-violent world, in accordance with the principles of the Delhi Declaration, which reflects the aspirations of states and peoples in all continents.

The belief that war can no longer be an instrument of politics, that reliance on military strength has no future and that today's imperative is peace through reason, is gaining ground in the international community. Rivalry between states is giving way to dialogue and interaction. The world is entering a post-confrontational period.

One of the most remarkable achievements of the USSR-US dialogue has been the impressive progress made in the field of nuclear disarmament. The process must be expanded with the participation of other nuclear-weapon states and deepened to move decisively towards a phased, time-bound elimination of nuclear weapons. Conferment of any form of sanctity on nuclear weapons in inadmissible. The agreements between the USSR and the USA in principle to reduce other weapons of mass destruction and the progress made towards conventional disarmament has set the pace towards mutual understanding and cooperation. It is important that all states whether nuclear or non-nuclear, join in these efforts.

The favourable political changes that are under way in the world are opening new vistas for settling regional conflicts and crisis situations as well as for solving many other problems facing mankind.

The need of the hour is the establishment of a new structure of international economic relations based on the principles of justice and equal rights, which should create practical conditions for a dignified and prosperous life for all. The diversion of resources from armament to development should become a major means of achieving this goal. The peace dividend should become the level for financial and economic revitalisation. Its potential for promoting national and international action for development needs to be maximised.

Mankind's future well-being is closely linked to solving demographic and environmental problems which are getting ever more acute. A fundamentally new framework should be established for universal cooperation of states in protecting the environment and developing the principles of environmental ethics. In doing so the organic link between environment and development and the principle of equitable burden sharing should be duly observed.

No single state or group of states, howsoever powerful, can cope with these problems acting alone. The search for a comprehensive structure of peace and security—

political, military, economic, environmental and humanitarian is a pressing task. Such a structure can be put in place only through joint efforts by east and west, north and south, taking into account the interests of each and every member of the international community. It should be forward looking, capable of meeting the challenges of the 21st century and beyond.

This system cannot but be multilateralism under the United Nations which is the basis for conducting interstate relations in a truly democratic manner and ensuring peace, security and cooperation with the full participation of all nations.

In our interdependent world, there are no separate destinies. Building of a common European home will obviously have its implications for the rest of the world. As the politics of balance of power is outmoded, there is no rationale for military blocs in Europe. Nor can they be maintained to deal with imagined threats. Europe can be secure only when all other regions of our planet are also secure.

Positive trends are emerging on the continent of Asia as well. Inspired by their ancient heritage and learning from their political experience, the nations of Asia are seeking to attain qualitatively new levels in their relations with a view to achieve progress and prosperity.

Democratic temper is gaining ground in the world today. On the international plane, it is acknowledged that the key problems of our times can be solved only through multilateral cooperation. At the national level, people everywhere are asserting their human rights and fundamental freedoms. Democracy demands primacy of the rule of law and respect for the rights of individuals and ethnic, religious, and other minorities. It demands urgent attention to meeting the basic human needs. Democracy is, however, being threatened by the growth of racial and religious extremism, violence and terrorism and other forms of hatred. Non-violence, tolerance of social diversities, and a just internal economic and political order are integral to a stable and civilised international order.

More than at any other previous moment in recent history, mankind has the prospect of building a new structure of cooperation and brotherhood among nations and peoples. India and the Soviet Union are determined to contribute constructively and vigorously to the attainment of this goal. Towards this end they will utilise fully the proven potential of their multi-faceted interaction in international and bilateral affairs, as a powerful factor in promoting peace and stability in Asia and the world.

[Signed] (V.P. Singh) prime minister of the Republic

(M. Gorbachev) president of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

[Dated] Moscow, 23rd July, 1990."

Gorbachev Hosts Dinner for Indian Premier

LD2307165190 Moscow TASS in English 1648 GMT 23 Jul 90

[Text] Moscow July 23 TASS—A dinner on behalf of the Soviet leadership was given in honour of Indian Prime Minister Vishwanath Pratap Singh and his wife in the Grand Kremlin Palace today. Indian officials accompanying the prime minister were also present.

On the Soviet side, the dinner was attended by President Mikhail Gorbachev and his wife, Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov, and other officials.

Gorbachev and Singh exchanged speeches.

The dinner was held in a warm and friendly atmosphere.

Gorbachev Makes Dinner Address

LD2307174590 Moscow TASS in English 1716 GMT 23 Jul 90

[Text] Moscow July 23 TASS—The Soviet leadership today gave a dinner in the Grand Kremlin Palace for Indian Prime Minister Vishwanath Pratap Singh and his wife.

Indian officials accompanying him also attended.

The Soviet side was represented by Mikhail Gorbachev and his wife, Nikolay Ryzhkov and other officials.

Gorbachev and Singh exchanged speeches.

Follows the Soviet president's speech:

Esteemed Mr. Prime Minister,
Esteemed Mrs. Singh,
Ladies and gentlemen,
Comrades,

We are happy to greet friendly India's head of government and members of the Indian delegation in the Kremlin.

Your visit, Mr. Prime Minister, signifies continuity in Soviet-Indian relations. You and I have just signed another joint document. It reaffirms and develops the Delhi Declaration, the ideas of which have become world property and are entering into political practice.

The Soviet-Indian factor in world politics continues to exert influence. I am convinced that the latest Soviet-Indian summit will give it a second wind amid the deep-going, unprecedented changes that are taking place throughout the world.

On behalf of the Soviet people, the millions of admirers of Rabindranath Tagore, permit me to express cordial gratitude for your wonderful gift to our capital—the monument to the great Indian, which will be unveiled tomorrow.

Rabindranth Tagore once said that no nation could follow the path of progress unless other nations

embarked on it too. We are satisfied to note today that this was among the universally shared ideas that formed the basis of our new thinking.

It applies to both the world community and of nations and such multinational states as the Soviet Union and India.

The fate of the world on the threshold of another millennium turns on the extent to which the growing integrity of civilisation and interdependence of states and nations will be taken into account and on how consistently the principle of free choice will be respected.

The rejection of power politics involving the use of armed strength, the renunciation of the arms race in the name of national security, and the promotion of disarmament as a factor for development are a corollary of the correct understanding of realities and imperatives of the coming epoch

This understanding is forcefully winning over the minds of both politicians and the public at large.

We are proud that perestroyka and our new foreign policy have set powerful constructive forces in motion across the world, impelled states and nations that opposed one another during the "cold war" to take steps towards one another, and cleared the way towards a peaceful period in the history of civilisation.

We are grateful to all who have chosen to believe us, responded to our initiatives, and showed understanding and readiness to build new international relations jointly.

Great India supported us and joined our side in this imposing undertaking. We appreciate this and are convinced that the political capital of Soviet-Indian interaction will continue to accrue in the interest of our people, in the interest of Asia, progress and peace.

Our friendship has been forged over decades. Its strength is in our two peoples' long-standing affection for each other and unflagging interest in each other.

Several generations of politicians, scholars and outstanding cultural personalities contributed their work and talents to fostering a truly unique relationship between our two distinctly different nations. Soviet-Indian cooperation has a marked positive effect on East-West relations. But it is to play an even bigger role in resolving the universal North-South problem, in overcoming poverty and backwardness, and in shaping a new world economic order.

We identify with the Indian Government's efforts to improve relations with its neighbours. We sincerely hope that problems in the Asian subcontinent will be solved by political means, on the basis of the principles of the Delhi Declaration.

Dear friends, Soviet-Indian summit dialogue is the determinant of relations between our two countries. In the course of our talks, which opened today, we shall mutually benefit by comparing notes on current developments and frankly discussing problems of concern to the whole world.

This will help understand more clearly priorities in bilateral cooperation, chart ways to upgrade it, and remove hitches that inevitably arise.

We count on the Soviet radical reform and the Indian desire to scale new heights in social and economic development making a positive impact on our economic relations and offering opportunities to make fuller use of the potential of economic, commercial, scientific and technical exchanges, which was accumulated over the years, to mutual benefit, for the good of both nations.

I wish prosperity and peace to the Government of India and the great Indian people.

To the health of esteemed Prime Minister and Mrs. Singh,

To Soviet-Indian friendship.

Singh Gives Dinner Speech

LD2307182490 Moscow TASS in English 1742 GMT 23 Jul 90

[Text] Moscow July 23 TASS—Follows the full text of Indian Prime Minister 'Ishwanath Pratap Singh's speech at a dinner given in his honour:

Your Excellency, President Gorbachev,
Madame Gorbacheva,
Excellencies, ladies and gentlemen,

I am delighted to be once again in this historic and great city, among valued and trusted friends. My wife and I and the members of my delegation are deeply touched by your affectionate welcome and warm hospitality. I thank you for your graciousness and for the kind sentiments that you have expressed about India and its people.

I am priviliged to be visiting the Soviet Union at a time of its exciting and historic evolution. There have been rare moments in history when the people of a country take their destiny firmly in their own hands and change it. At such times, the placid stream of history turns into a roaring torrent. Few leaders have deliberately chosen to unlock such elemental forces of change, and fewer still have shown the sagacity to harness popular expectations and aspirations not only for the well-being of their people but for a better future for all mankind. The fact that you have embarked on this noble endeavour, with such courage and foresight, has won for you, Mr. President, the admiration and respect of the people of India and the entire world.

The Soviet Union gave birth to the original socialist revolution. Today it is experiencing a second revolution, which is as exciting and momentous. We in India wish

you every success. We have an important stake in the success of perestroyka and in a stable, united and prosperous Soviet Union.

Mr. President, your courage and your visionary thinking in international affairs has brought about far-reaching changes all over the world. Confrontation is being fast replaced by cooperation. Continuing progress is being made in the field of disarmament. Many longstanding regional conflicts are well on the way to resolution. The imperative need to create a new world order that can maximise the benefits of peace is beginning to occupy the minds of leaders all over the world. There is hope that the last decade of this century will mark the beginning of a new era that is safer, more humane, more prosperous and more just.

Indo-Soviet friendship, nurtured by consistent efforts of both of our countries and frequent high level exchanges, has developed and diversified rapidly over the past four decades. Ours has been a uniquely stable and resilient relationship that has weathered many changes in the international situation. Our friendship has stood to the test of time, since it is not based on the expediency of the moment or on any partisan considerations, but on the fundamental values cherished by both our peoples. The Soviet Union has stood steadfastly by our side at critical times for us. Friendship with the people of the Soviet Union is therefore a part of the psyche of every Indian. It is now beyond partisan consideration. No change of government or policy can make a dent in it.

Our relationship is characterised by mutual respect and an understanding of each other's interests. The Indo-Soviet Treaty of Peace, Friendship and Cooperation is an important milestone on our relationship. The treaty fully reflects the fundamental principles on which our relationship is based and has abiding relevance and validity.

The economic and commercial ties between India and the Soviet Union have grown and diversified rapidly. They have admirably served the interests of our two countries. Much of our heavy industry was established with generous Soviet assistance. I am confident that our cooperation in the core sectors of our economies will continue to be strengthened. New forms of cooperation are being explored and will no doubt fructify. Perestroyka in the Soviet Union and the structural changes we are bringing about in our economy will provide new challenges and fresh oportunities for diversifying and expanding our economic relations.

Our cooperation in science and technology has yielded very valuable dividends, with increasing practical applications in areas of direct benefit to the people. The festivals in both countries exposed our peoples to the rich cultural heritages and modern achievements of our two countries.

We strongly support and wish every success to your efforts to integrate the Soviet Union into the mainstream of the world economy. Our efforts are in the same direction. We are convinced that greater integration and recognition of interdependence would contribute not only to economic growth and wellbeing but also to peace and stability. We believe that social conflict and tension in the world cannot be removed unless a conscious effort is made to remove inequities and imbalances and to integrate developing countries into the world economy.

Mr. President, our world view and our foreign policy objectives are closely akin to yours. The Delhi Declaration is a historic document, representing our common vision of a non-violent world free of nuclear weapons. We seek to end conflict, promote friendship, trust and understanding and to create a peaceful external environment in which we can devote all our energies to the task of development. Our policy is fully reflected in the mandate that we have received from our people. To this end, we attach high priority to the improvement of relations with all our neighbours. In the brief period that we have been in government, we have made significant progress in this direction.

Our region remains one of the poorest in the world, though we are rich in natural resources and the creative skills and talents of our people. We cannot afford to waste our energies in nurturing old antagonisms. We must look to the future. Neighbours should not try to undermine each other's sovereignty and territorial integrity. We cannot remain out of step with the aspirations of our peoples for a better life. The common problems of poverty, disease, environmental degradation, drug trafficking and international terrorism can be tackled more effectively through cooperative endeavour. We will do our best to give a decisive thrust to the process of regional cooperation under SAARC [South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation] so that the South Asian region can become a model of peace and prosperity in the years to come. We also see this process as an intrinsic part of larger goal—the realisation of Jawaharlal Nehru's vision of interdependent and resurgent Asia.

Mr. President, we greatly value the understanding and support which we have always received from the Soviet Union on issues of concern to us. This deep understanding has informed and enriched our friendship and contributed to peace and stability in our region and the world. I am confident that the common perspectives that we share on key issues will continue to impart strength and dynamism to our friendship and cooperation.

Excellencies, ladies and gentlemen,

May I now request you to raise your glasses in a toast

—To the health of His Excellency, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, president of the USSR and general secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU,

—To Madame Raisa Gorbacheva,

—To the further prosperity and progress of the great Soviet people, and

To the ever growing friendship and cooperation between our two countries and people.

Talks Termed 'Productive'

LD2407073190 Moscow TASS in English 0725 GMT 24 Jul 90

[By TASS correspondent Ivan Ivanov, Igor Peskov, and Oleg Polovko]

[Text] Moscow, 24 Jul TASS—Indian Prime Minister Viswanath Pratap Singh began the second day of his stay in the Soviet Union by placing flowers at [the] monument to India's national-liberation leader Mahatma Gandhi on Moscow's Lomonosov Avenue.

The monument was unveiled in the Soviet capital on July 8, 1988. The sculpture, showing Gandhi striding forward, his face calm and wise, up a mountain, was made by Indian artist Gautal Pal.

Speaking at the wreath-laying ceremony, Singh said relations between India and the Soviet Union were comprehensive and were going through a very important stage in their development.

Singh said he signed a joint statement with Mikhail Gorbachev and discussed key bilateral and international issues.

He described the talks as productive.

Singh then laid flowers to the monument of Indira Gandhi.

He also paid tribute to Javaharlal Nehru, laying flowers at a memorial plaque in honour of the fiery fighter for India's independence and its first prime minister.

Talks with Ryzhkov Continue 24 Jul

LD2407084790 Moscow TASS in English 0840 GMT 24 Jul 90

[Text] Moscow July 24—Official Soviet-Indian talks continued in the Kremlin today.

The sides' delegations are led by Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov and his Indian counterpart Vishwanath Pratap Singh.

After the talks, Singh will have one-to-one talks with President Mikhail Gorbachev at the Ekatereninsky Hall in the Kremlin.

1 Soviet Killed, 2 Injured in Kabul Shelling

LD2207165890 Moscow TASS in English 1649 GMT 22 Jul 90

[Text] Kabul July 22 TASS—Afghan rebels again shelled Kabul today. A missile hit the House of Soviet Science and Culture, killing and injuring Soviet specialists, who were sent to Afghanistan to do assembly work. I. Arkharov was killed, N. Nikolayev and D. Shanov were wounded by missile fragments.

The wounded were taken to a hospital of the Soviet Embassy, where they are given medical aid. According to medics, their lives are out of danger.

The House of Soviet Science and Culture was seriously damaged.

About a year and a half have passed since the end of the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan, but the war continues to claim more lives, this time those of Soviet specialists. The senselessness and lack of perspective of the armed conflict involving a tremendous loss of life is now obvious. However, the inertia of many years of hostility and bloodshed is too strong. In this situation the initiatives of the Afghan leadership headed by President Najibullah look realistic. A possible agreement between the USSR and the United States about the mutual termination of arms deliveries to the warring parties and on other steps aimed at the restoration of peace in Afghanistan also give grounds for hope.

Shelling Called 'Barbaric'

LD2307093190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0830 GMT 23 Jul 90

["TASS report" from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Following the bombardment of Kabul, which led to the death of the Soviet specialist Arkharov and the wounding of two other specialists, a spokesman for the USSR Foreign Ministry has stated that this barbaric act of international terrorism proves yet again that the Afghan armed opposition will stop at nothing in pursuit of its ambitions. The organizers of this action, which had such tragic consequences, should know that they will not succeed in avoiding responsibility for the crime perpetrated, the statement says.

Afghan Efforts To Release POW's Detailed

LD2307180690 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1645 GMT 23 Jul 90

[From the "International Diary" program, presented by Vladimir Pasko]

[Text] The Government of Afghanistan has literally just handed over to the Soviet envoy in Kabul (Kapadze), another former Soviet serviceman.

And here is another reassuring report. Through the efforts of the security bodies of Afghanistan, it has been possible to release another eight of our people. President Najibullah reported that in Kabul. The released men will be handed over to the Soviet side in the next day or two.

The Afghan Government is making every effort to have our prisoners released. Recently, I had occasion to meet in Kabul a staff member of the state security of Afghanistan who is directly connected with that problem. In the

words of the secretary of the special government commission for the release of prisoners, Colonel (Zakhir), the Afghan side has information on 40 of our prisoners held by the opposition in Afghanistan and of a further approximately 70 persons held in Pakistan.

We remember the appeal of Comrade Gorbachev to President Najibullah and conversations with deputies of the USSR Supreme Soviet, Col. (Zakhir) assured. We are making every effort to ensure that Soviet people who have fallen into the hands of the opposition are returned home as soon as possible.

I will note that the Government of Afghanistan achieves the release of our people by means of exchange or paying ransom. Moreover, all of that is preceded by highly risky and delicate work.

Tensions Heighten Between Iraq, Kuwait

LD2007192190 Moscow International Service in Arabic 1500 GMT 20 Jul 90

[Aleksey Zlatorunskiy commentary]

[Text] Tension in the relations between Iraq and Kuwait is being heightened. Muhammad Abu al-Hasan, state of Kuwait's representative to the United Nations, has conveyed a message from Shaykh Jabir al-Ahmad al-Sabah to Perez De Cuellar, UN secretary general. The message explains the State of Kuwait's viewpoint regarding the emerging dispute. Chedli Klibi, Arab League secretary general, travelled immediately to Kuwait. And active consultations between Arab countries, members of the Gulf Cooperation Council [GCC], are being held. The American State Department has made a special statement on the situation in the region. All facts point to the seriousness of the situation.

It is noteworthy to point out that the seriousness of the situation looks like it's getting worse, in the first place, before being internationalized. Iraq has moved from accusing the State of Kuwait of violating its oil quota, a matter which has contributed to the drop of oil prices in the international oil market, to territorial matters, a matter which has aroused the State of Kuwait's negative reaction which has made similar accusations against Iraq and called on the Arab League to resolve the border dispute between the two countries. It has been said that the Kuwaiti leadership is determined to involve the United Nations in resolving the dispute.

News reports from the Gulf region indicate that active consultations are underway between the GCC member countries. King Fahd, the monarch of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia; 'Ali Abdallah Salih, the Yemeni president; and Shaykh 'Isa Bin Salman, ruler of Bahrain; as well as other officials have all had talks with both the Iraqi President Saddam Husayn and the Kuwaiti ruler Shaykh Jabir al-Ahmad al-Sabah. Such talks tried to eliminate the tension between Iraq and Kuwait and find a solution through a roundtable on the basis of the balance of interests.

The time factor is important in these circumstances; any procrastination to resolve such a problem could lead to an unpredictable outcome. It is noteworthy to recall in this respect the U.S. State Department's statement which reaffirmed principally the U.S. readiness to guarantee free passage for oil tankers through the Hormuz Straits as well as the freedom of navigation. Washington has expressed its support for friendly Gulf countries and their right to defend themselves, in particular. It is noteworthy here to mention the speed of the U.S. State Department's reaction to the development of the situation in the Gulf region. If one looks back at the U.S. State Department's similar statement, made not long ago, than one can easily remember the measures taken following such statements: The Gulf region became for a long time a permanent place of anchorage for the U.S. war fleet.

Time has changed. However, it is not difficult to imagine that if such a matter is repeated again then the idea of making the Gulf region a weapon free zone will emerge again as well as the need to set up a system of guaranteed inter-security.

Therefore, it is easy to understand the Gulf countries' feeling of anxiety as well as their call for the two parties to show wisdom and good sense.

Arms Sales, Military Ties to Libya Cited

PM2007150690 Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 29 17-23 Jul 90 pp 18-19

[Article by Dmitriy Yefstafyev: "Dollars And Debts"]

[Text]

Heaps of Soviet Arms to Libya. For What Purpose?

The coup in Libya on September 1, 1969, threw Western capitals into confusion. Moscow breathed a sigh of relief: it turned out to be a people's revolution. The new leaders in Tripoli hastened to meet with the Soviet ambassador and express their desire to cooperate with the USSR. Moscow won a small victory in its endless gambit with Washington.

The late 1960s saw a final shaping of Moscow's globalism. The Soviet Union tried to balance out its geopolitical positions with those of the United States. The expansion of Soviet influence in Libya held out important strategic advantages. There was one decisive factor in this situation: Libya would completely drop out of NATO's Mediterranean system.

It will be recalled that Washington and the deposed king concluded an agreement on the unlimited use of Libyan territory for military purposes. Other NATO countries also availed themselves of the opportunity. For instance, Britain concluded an agreement on the establishment of a missile anti-aircraft defence in Libya worth 1000 million Libyan pounds and on the delivery of heavy armaments. The Libyans, who overthrew King Idris, considered their country an Anglo-American protectorate.

The consequences of the revolution were not long in coming. In March-April 1970, the evacuation of all British troops from Libya was completed, and in June the Americans also left the country.

As it often happens, the leaders of the revolution did not have a clearly formulated ideology or, speaking more generally, firm views regarding the country's future progress. The overthrow of the monarcy was, perhaps, the only consolidating factor. Like many Arab nationalists, the Al-Qadhdhafi followers (who acted as nationalists, first of all) were attracted by the policy of balancing between the great powers with the aim of gaining an advantage from the American-Soviet confrontation. Since the United States backed the royal regime, the leaders of the Libyan revolution saw their ally in the Soviet Union. Moscow's anti-Israeli stand was also taken into account.

The Soviet leadership was guided mainly by this principle. That is why it did not seriously analyze the character of the Libyan revolution and its potential.

After the relations between Moscow and Cairo had worsened in the 1970s, the Soviet leadership showed a greater interest in Libya as an ally and a counterweight to Egypt, whose President Sadat had obviously adopted the policy of comprehensive cooperation with the United States.

Soviet foreign policy is believed to be extremely ideologized. What can be said in this connection? A perusal of the Libyan press of the early and mid-1980s clearly shows that the attitude towards communism as an ideology was implacably hostile in the country at the time. Al-Qadhdhafi did not conceal that he cooperated with Moscow only because it supplied weapons to Libya. But Moscow ignored his attacks on communism ideology for the sake of preserving good relations.

In March 1970, a high-level Libyan delegation flew to Moscow for talks on "questions of mutual interest." The range of questions was not specified. It is well known, however, that large-scale military cooperation began after the visit. It should be noted that the Middle East situation at the time was characterized by a new escalation in the Arab-Israeli conflict. Preparations were made for a war to regain the territories captured by Tel Aviv. The Libyans, who regarded their country as a rear area in the struggle against Israel, displayed quite natural interest in defence matters.

In spite of glasnost, the USSR Defence Ministry keeps its secrets, and for this reason we have to use information drawn from foreign sources.

According to the Stockholm-based International Peace Research Institute, drastic growth in Libya's military expenditure was noted by 1970. Between 1965 and 1970 Libya's military spending went up from $25.9 million to $365 million. By 1973, the figure had risen to $400 million, amounting to 6.8 percent of the country's GNP. I would not explain such a rapid growth of military expenditure only by the need of preparing for a war against Israel.

Libya's military expenditure continued to soar, reaching $7,990 million in 1979. What it really means becomes evident from a comparison of this huge sum with the country's 3.9 million population, half of which are women, children and elderly people.

In the post-revolution period, from 1965 to 1975, when the principal military contracts with the United States and Britain had been abrogated, Libya became the tenth largest importer of arms in the world, slightly lagging behind Iraq, which had a considerably bigger population. In view of the aggravation of relations with the West in 1973, caused by the introduction of an oil embargo, it can be said that the Soviet Union accounts for an appreciable sum of arms deliveries.

A Dangerous Lead

One can say that the vast amount of weapons was intended for the defence of the country which pursued an anti-imperialist foreign policy. Let's turn, however, to the world famous Jane's directory, which indicates the types of weapons supplied to one or another country has. Soviet arms can be found in various countries, with the exception of NATO states and countries with which Moscow does not have good relations. Such a rivalry on the part of the Soviet Union would be welcome in civilian branches of the economy.

In Libya, few other countries' hardware is represented. Its land forces have several thousands of Soviet tanks, with only a few dozen of Italian tanks among them. The few Mirage planes are virtually lost in the mass of MIG planes supplied for the country's air force.

Does Libya need such an amount of weapons? I could not find a clear answer in official sources. It cannot be said that the weapons have not been used at all: there was the conflict with Egypt, the abortive war with Chad, and the air raid on Libya in 1986, during which Libya's anti-aircraft defence system comprised mainly of Soviet systems, proved so ineffective that Americans freely manoeuvred in the skies above Tripoli and Benghazi.

Examining western sources, I wondered who, and for what purpose, decided to supply Libya with medium-range bombers which can by no means be called defensive weapons. The Soviet Union's motives were clear, of course. It wanted to create a state of uncertainty on NATO's southern flank. Nevertheless, no country producing medium-range bombers supplies them to other states. The Soviet Union became a pioneer in this respect, and it is a dangerous lead.

Also interesting is the story of Soviet tactical missiles which had been supplied to Libya and then appeared in Iran and other countries. As for the construction of a nuclear research centre, the access to which was soon

restricted for Soviet experts thereafter, this case deserves a special hearing in the parliament.

Who Is Indebted to Whom?

According to our data Libya's debt to the Soviet Union runs into 1,707 million convertible roubles. However, the most trustworthy Western sources put Libya's total military and commercial debt to the Soviet Union at a much bigger figure. Which figure is more trustworthy?

There could be no talk about this three or four years ago. Today a more balanced approach is needed. In any case, there is good reason to believe that the lion's share of the debt has formed owing to arms deliveries.

Soviet-Libyan cooperation has one more political aspect. Money is money. It is extremely necessary in the country's present critical situation. There is, however, something higher which no money can buy. the days of the unreserved support of "liberation movements" and "anti-imperialist states" have gone. In its foreign policy, the Soviet Union is trying to rely on generally recognized international standards. Nevertheless, there have been reports on the delivery of modern combat planes to Libya. One recalls recent scandalous exposes involving Soviet weapons and the way the late Romanian dictator used them.

We are not talking about American or Soviet "globalism" today. The very word will soon become archaic. In the present conditions, trade in arms looks like a process directly opposed to modern tendencies in the world. Nevertheless, it is still to early to talk about the banning of military business. Moscow sells arms to Arab countries, and Washington sells arms to israel. The latter sells its arms to about 50 countries. Everything is so complicated that one should not be surprised when Soviet arms are used against the Soviet Union's friends.

It should be noted, however, that in the United States, arms trade is under the control of the Congress. The time has come to place this business under strict parliamentary control in the Soviet Union so that the public knows where the deadly cargoes are sent and why.

East Europe

Commentator Views Improving Albania Ties

LD2307215290

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1645 GMT on 23 July, in its "International Diary" program, carries a three-and-a-half minute commentary by Igor Surguchev on Soviet-Albanian relations in light of the interview given to Soviet Television by Niko Djyarzi, secretary general of the Albanian Council of Ministers. In this interview, Djyarzi hoped that diplomatic and other relations between the USSR and Albania would be normalized soon and that friendship between the two peoples and countries would be reestablished.

"It seems that the question of the restoration of Soviet-Albanian relations has been determined in advance," Surguchev says. "Moreover, it is not just a question of the renewal of diplomatic relations, but of initiating contacts and cooperation in different spheres; that is, of the complete normalization of relations between Albania and our country.

"Moreover, the representative of the Albanian Government, in the conversation with the special correspondent of Gosteleradio [State Radio and Television], even came out in favor of the restoration of friendship between the two countries and peoples, which linked them over 15 post-war years. We have not heard such things from Albanian officials over practically the past three decades, when what seemed like an insurmountable wa!! of hostility and alienation stood between the USSR and Albania. But the first cracks in this wall appeared at the beginning of this year. They increased significantly after the statements by Alia, the party and state leader of Albania, and Carcani, the head of the government, on the readiness to resume diplomatic relations with the USSR and the United States.

"I think that it is already possible now to speak of that wall, a sorry vestige of the mistakes of the former leaders of both our countries, seeing its last months, and, one would like to believe, days, too. Well, now it has long been time to close the bitter pages of our relations which do not do honor to either Moscow or Tirana.

"It is pleasing that the desire of the Soviet Union to re-establish bilateral links, which has manifested itself with particular sincerity and consistency since spring 1985, has at last found a positive response in the country of the eagles, as Albania is often called. Of course, that is no accident. After all, today, life is demanding more persistently than ever before that the unnatural situation, whereby there were no normal diplomatic relations between two European states which, in the past, were friends and allies, too, be eliminated.

"The destruction of the above-mentioned ill-starred wall is promoted, to a decisive extent, by the new thinking in Soviet foreign policy, its de-ideologization, the active search for radical solutions to international problems, and also the new, reassuring tendencies, both in the foreign and domestic policy of Albania. Over the past few years, the Republic has been coming out of international isolation, taking part in Balkan cooperation, and has shown a desire to join in the pan-European process of guaranteeing security and cooperation.

"In domestic policy, the Albanian leadership has promulgated the policy for the democratization of sociopolitical life and for reform. And some things have already been done and are being done in that direction.

"I will not try to guess how the implementation of that policy will proceed in the future, but in my opinion, it is clear that Albania is striving to get rid of the unflattering epithet of the last bulwark of orthodox Stalinism. And that is creating good prerequisites, not only for the

renewal of Soviet-Albanian relations, but also for their subsequent successful development," Surguchev concludes.

Bulgarian Paper Cited on Wave of Emigration

PM2007122190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Jul 90 Morning Edition p 5

[Report by IZVESTIYA correspondent A. Kapralov: "Standing in Line for Europe—Who Is Last?"]

[Text] Sofia—The headline has nothing to do with the socialists' "Bulgarian path to Europe" platform. It applies only to those who are trying to cover this ground by the shortest route—through the gates of border checkpoints—in order to escape on their own initiative from the economic crisis that grips the country.

Only six months ago, the Sofia paper TRUD writes, any Bulgarian who dared to remain abroad without permission was regarded as a traitor and a deserter. "Now we have been all over the world. Young and old, educated people with degrees, nongraduates, highly skilled people, common wasters, romantics and the cunning, calculating type."

The law on foreign passports, adopted a year ago, that is, note, under the former regime, made the exit procedure simplicity itself. You get a five-year passport and you drive, fly, walk wherever you like, as long as you get a foreign visa, of course. Every morning, outside the FRG, American, and Greek embassies there are lines of people looking for adventure with application forms and copies of certificates in their hands. The chances of obtaining work abroad are minimal. It is difficult for tourists too, and Bulgarians mainly travel in their own cars to get abroad. To do it you have to demonstrate to the Greek consular service, for example, that you have $20 for each day of your stay in that country. For Italy the sum is equivalent to $15, Belgium,—$50, and the United States—$150. Nevertheless, around 30,000 Bulgarians have already vanished without trace in Greece alone, working illegally.

Once a year the state issues only $30 to a foreign passport holder with an exit visa. So where does the majority get the currency? I will give just one example. When Yugoslavia announced internal convertibility of the dinar at the beginning of the year, tens of thousands of Bulgarians poured in, having stuffed the trunks of their cars with smoked sausage and cheeses, electric kettles, overalls, jackets—in short, anything that could be sold at a profit on the other side for dinars. They changed the money for marks or dollars and in a day or two the resourceful "tourist" had a nice sum in convertible currency.

The Bulgarian customs are not interested in where the currency came from—the main thing is that it should be recorded in the declaration, which in turn entitles people to put the money in the bank. The material basis then exists for the next trip. Indeed, the state does not lose out either—in only a few months several million dollars were put into bank accounts.

According to the data for 10 June, 1.17 million people have gone abroad since the beginning of the year and 973,000 have returned. (That is more than 10 percent of the country's population!)

As TRUD put it, an entire Bulgarian city of around 80,000 population has vanished in broad daylight. According to a lightning poll, "The Emigration Wave in Bulgaria," conducted by the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences Sociology Institute, 73 percent of those questioned would like to have permanent or temporary work abroad. One-half would like to work in their own specialty, while the other half is prepared to do anything. In the main they are people with secondary or higher education, more often than not engineers. The ages of 74 percent of those questioned were between 18 and 40.

The workers who conducted the poll arrived at the conclusion that the wave of emigration had reached dangerous proportions. In most cases the reasons for emigrating are distinctly political. It is no accident that the number of people wanting to leave has increased sharply since the elections, it which, as is known, the Bulgarian Socialist Party won a majority in parliament.

Not a day passes without the newspapers, radio, and television raising the "exit" theme. Moreover, it is characteristic that no one is condemning his fellow citizens. People sympathize with them, envy them, give them a good send-off, and wish them a swift return with a store of knowledge and experience of value to the country, but they certainly do not berate them. The negative epithets are reserved for the system which has forced them to seek happiness outside the homeland.

Here are just a few answers to the questions about reasons for leaving: "Do you not see how relations between people have deteriorated here?" "For nine years we have occupied a living area of nine square meters with two children. Money is short. I hope to build a life for my family and I will take any work." "I do not want to be controlled by communists!" "In Bulgaria there are no conditions for those who want to work!"...

According to D. Minev, one of the scientists who conducted the poll, the majority of those leaving will return. Primarily, they will be those who succeed. "It may sound paradoxical," D. Minev believes, "but if Bulgaria wants to keep its children, we must help them to leave the country and ensure that they adapt as quickly as possible in the country they go to. This could help them retain a sense of national and civic belonging and reduce the number of those who return because they are ashamed to have failed."

For many years, TRUD writes, we have heard that we are living in a developed country with a just social system, whose main concern is the welfare of human beings. "We have now recognized, we now see how poor

we are, we now see that our lives have been accompanied by vice and crime, that the top people provided for themselves and their entourage but did not bother about us. People are leaving. It is difficult to live on the pay we get. We find it hard to feed and clothe ourselves. We are struggling for survival. We have sacrificed everything for future generations. We were too frightened to shout out loud that we wanted our own brief human life to be a better one...."

"In the world of private enterprise is there, perhaps, still something left for us Bulgarians who have set out into the big wide world?" the Bulgarian trade union organ asks in conclusion.

Supreme Soviet Chairman, Bulgarian Official Meet

PM2007142990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 Jul 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Letter of greetings from USSR Supreme Soviet Chairman A. Lukyanov to Bulgarian People's Assembly Chairman N. Todorov; date of letter not given]

[Text] To Nikolay Todorov, chairman of the Great People's Assembly of the Bulgarian People's Republic.

Please accept my sincere congratulations on your election as chairman of the Bulgarian Great People's Assembly.

I am confident that the ties between the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Bulgarian Great People's Assembly will help deepen the processes of democratization in our countries and strengthen Soviet-Bulgarian friendship and multilevel cooperation and will serve the interests of peace and security in Europe.

I wish you successful activity for the good of the Bulgarian people.
[Signed] A. Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Communist Party of Czechoslovakia Viewed

LD1907190490 Moscow International Service in Czech 1700 GMT 18 Jul 90

[Commentary by Igor Sidorovich, Moscow radio editor: "The Communist Party of Czechoslovakia—the Program Objectives of the Renewal"—read by announcer]

[Text] Only a year ago Czechoslovak citizens were watching with hope the events in the Soviet Union, and saw their future in our transformations. Nowadays, we, too, can learn a lot from our neighbors. And thus, all is interconnected in this world. This is why I think that no explanation is needed for why we in Moscow are excited by the present position of Czechoslovak communists. Despite losing its leading role in the country, the communist party still remains the topic of conversation, because in particular what is happening in the party makes one think hard. You must agree that in Czechoslovakia it would be hard to find another party whose history would undergo such a reversal: Several decades of monopoly power followed by a sharp fall, which lasted only several weeks. One could say that this was the ruling of history, period. But it is too early to say that. I, in particular, felt true respect for the Czechoslovak communists, especially in recent months. Much quicker than anyone else, they overcome their own errors. They regrouped themselves, as they say, and took up a respectable place in the political structure of the new Czechoslovakia. By this I do not mean to say that the communist party of Czechoslovakia is the most radical force in the country. There are many parties more progressive, for example, the Socialist Party and the Social Democrats. They nevertheless (?came after) the communists in the pre-election marathon. Is this a paradox? I think not. The communists have adopted from the past all that was best; they surrendered that which was worst, and created in essence a new leftist party. All they kept was their old title. The evidence of this is the recent session of the executive committee of the Czechoslovak Communist Party [CPCZ] Central Committee, which discussed preparations for the 18th party congress.

I went ahead of myself a bit when I said that the CPCZ has already transformed itself into a modern party of a leftist type. The Czechoslovak communists themselves are of the view that only the first steps have been made in this direction. Fortunately, the election result did not make them dizzy. None of the CPCZ members showed a wish to be restricted by it. Life has demonstrated that nothing comes for free, and that efforts have to be made in order to remove the obstacle blocking the path.

In conclusion, I would recall that the CPCZ describes itself in the draft of new rules as a leftist party of labor and democratic socialism, which has definitely surrendered power monopoly and also all organizational privileges typical of totalitarian systems.

Czechoslovak Envoy Views Ties in Wake of Change

PM2307104990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Jul 90 Second Edition p5

[Interview with R. Slansky, Czechoslovak ambassador to the Soviet Union, by L. Chausov in the PRAVDA Editorial Office on 19 July under the heading "'As Good Neighbors....'"—first two paragraphs are report and introduction]

[Text] On 19 July R. Slansky, Czechoslovak ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the Soviet Union, visited the PRAVDA Editorial Office. He was received by I.T. Frolov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chief editor of PRAVDA. During their conversation they touched on questions concerning the political situation in both countries. They exchanged opinions on the course and results of the 28th CPSU Congress.

A lightning interview given by R. Slansky is offered for readers' attention.

[Chausov] Our countries have a long-standing relationship. How do you believe these ties will develop in the future?

[Slansky] Let us take a look at the geographical map. We have always been and will continue to be neighbors. It is important for the two states to live as good neighbors and coexist peacefully. There is a hope—even a belief—that that will be the case. After all, there are no political problems between our countries. We must now work together to resolve our economic problems. It is important to jointly find the right approaches, even if this sometimes harms some of the other side's interests. We must continue to build our relations in such a way as to ensure that they are stable and lasting. I think that both sides have the goodwill for this.

[Chausov] How are you finding your work in Moscow when so many events are going on around you...?

[Slansky] Our era is a time of great change. There is a great deal of information to analyze when you observe what is happening around you. Especially now, since the 28th CPSU Congress, which people in Czechoslovakia followed closely, asking the main question: Will perestroyka move ahead and will the planned reforms be developed? In my view, the congress gave a positive response.

[Chausov] And how, in a few words, do you see the future of Soviet-Czechoslovak relations—from the viewpoint of building the common European home?

[Slansky] We could give each other a lot of help in this extremely important task, and also other "residents" of the future edifice. I also hope that no one in this home argues and that there is no evil "house manager." In short, I hope that peace and harmony will prevail throughout Europe.

Hungary's EEC Membership, NATO Ties Debated

PM2407102990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Jul 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Report by IZVESTIYA correspondent F. Lukyanov: "Hungary: New Stage of Cooperation"]

[Text] Budapest—Questions of Hungary's mutual relations with the EEC and NATO have been the center of attention at the talks of Hungarian Prime Minister J. Antall in Brussels, which he visited immediately after his recent visit to the FRG and France.

J. Antall's government had expressed itself earlier about Hungary's plans with regard to cooperation with these organizations. But on the eve of the visit the Hungarian side announced unambiguously its intention to become an EEC member, preferably before 1995, and to acquire the status of an associate member in 1992. With regard to NATO the desire was expressed to establish official diplomatic relations with it.

As far as Hungary's membership of the EEC is concerned, during the talks early in the week with J. Delors, chairman of the Commission of European Communities, the head of the Hungarian Government handed over a special memorandum containing the Hungarian side's thoughts on the question. J. Antall said after the meeting with J. Delors that in September this year bilateral talks will to all appearances begin on Hungary's associate membership of the EEC. The Hungarian prime minister also reported the accord which has been reached whereby Hungary can become an associate of this organization as of 1 January 1992 and whereby the "Common Market" has promised that in the very near future it will grant the Hungarian side privileges in economic, financial, scientific and cultural, and political cooperation. There may possibly be talk of a so-called free trade agreement.

It is indicative that when, at the meeting with Europarliament deputies, J. Antall was asked whether Hungarians know that EEC membership is accompanied by a certain restriction on their sovereignty and independence, the answer came that yes, they do know, and from the Hungarian viewpoint this is the only correct decision. At the same time it is noted that members of the EEC Council of Ministers were quite cautious with regard to the Hungarian leadership's strategy for accelerated entry to that organizations and according to the London newspaper THE GUARDIAN J. Delors made it clear that the expansion of the EEC is not the most paramount task.

After the meeting in Brussels with NATO Secretary General M. Woerner, J. Antall stated: "The prime aim of Hungarian foreign policy is inclusion in the process of European integration, which we link inextricably with the Atlantic idea...."

The head of the Hungarian Government noted at the same time that the Soviet Union must become a part of European security just like North America. It was also stated that NATO and Hungary have established official relations: The Hungarian ambassador in Belgium will henceforth also represent his country's interests with NATO. In addition agreement has been reached that the NATO secretary general will pay an official visit to Hungary in November from which the Hungarian side expects the further consolidation of bilateral relations.

Dialogue Recommended Following Events in Romania

PM1707141790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Jul 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Report by IZVESTIYA correspondent V. Volodin: "Students Want to Know the Truth"]

[Text] Bucharest—It was with a protest march that the Romanian capital marked the tragic events of 13-15 June, when vehicles were set alight on the streets of Bucharest and furious mobs stormed the Interior Ministry, police, and Romanian Television buildings. The order installed by the thousands of miners who came to

Bucharest cost Romania dear, primarily in its international prestige. The violence in response to violence did not pass without leaving its mark.

Now, one month later, having recovered from the shock, the student opposition has made its presence felt again. The officially authorized demonstration, in which around 10,000 people took part, began in the afternoon from Opera Square and went to the area where the Bucharest University faculties and student hostels are concentrated.

The column of thousands of demonstrators, predominantly young people carrying flowers symbolizing their noninvolvement in the pogroms, moved along Bucharest's avenues toward University Square. Calls to observe order and calm issued from bullhorns mounted on the minibus heading the demonstration. Banners with the slogans "Freedom for Marian Munteanu!"; "Censure the miners!"; "Down with communism!"; "From Jilava jail to liberty!" were carried above the demonstrators' heads in the sweltering heat.

The demonstration, organized by the League of Students and other Bucharest students organizations, passed through the entire city and it was not until the demonstrators reached Victory Square in front of the government building that they stopped and began chanting "Resign! Resign!" demanding that Romania's present leadership stand down. A group of demonstrators on the square went through the cordon of soldiers and policemen surrounding the government building and handed the secretary to the prime minister's office a petition demanding the release of those arrested in the events of 13-15 June, in particular M. Munteanu, chairman of the League of Students, and an investigation of the miners' actions in Bucharest. Incidentally, Senator Radu Campeanu, chairman of opposition National Liberal Party, has demanded in parliament that M. Munteanu be released and kept at liberty until his trial and also that the events be thoroughly investigated.

By way of a reminder, M. Munteanu, N. Leon, and D. Dinke [name as transliterated], who took part in the demonstration which sealed off University Square for over six weeks, were arrested by the police in June. A communique released at that time by the capital's prosecutor's office announced that they were charged with incitement, instigating criminal activity, corrupting morals, destroying public property, and active participation in storming the Interior Ministry and Romanian Television buildings. Meanwhile, the National Students Congress held in Bucharest recently completely rejected the charges against Munteanu. The document adopted by the congress notes that on the contrary he tried to prevent violence and to stop people attacking the Bucharest central police station. "On the morning of 14 June 1990 M. Munteanu was brutally beaten by miners, after which he was taken to the hospital where he was arrested on 18 June," the student congress declaration published by the independent weekly EXPRES says.

After the large number of highly conflicting commentaries in the Romanian press on the tragic events which resulted in six dead and hundreds injured, it is hard to say now where the truth lies. In any event, one would like the truth to surface as a result of the investigations which are being conducted by an interparliamentary commission. The Romanian press reports that French lawyers have taken up Munteanu's defense.

Whether the case will come to court or the events of 13-15 June will disappear without trace, just like the conclusions of the parliamentary commission which investigated the causes of the interethnic clashes in Tirgu Mures in March, is hard to say. Or rather—it is too soon to tell. The only thing, in my view, which Romania needs today is national reconciliation, which would make it possible to remove the mutual suspicion, fear, and even the elementary hatred still reigning here. Otherwise the country can hardly progress along the path of democratic transformations.

It is no coincidence that President Ion Iliescu of Romania, who spoke on television the same evening about the most acute social and economic problems and corruption gnawing at Romanian society, urged the country's citizens and all social organizations to show a sense of responsibility and mutual understanding, which would help to establish a climate of cooperation and dialogue including constructive criticism, things which Romania needs more than ever now.

Romania's Iliescu Cited on 13 June Events

90UF0330A Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 10 Jul 90 p 3

[Report by TASS correspondent Nikolay Morozov: "I. Iliescu's Interview"]

[Text] Bucharest, 9—Today, higher national interests, regardless of disagreements and contradictions that take place, must be placed in the foreground. This does not mean the elimination of different opinions or the ideological struggle—on the contrary, they are necessary for a continuous correction of decisions undertaken by the authorities. This was declared by Romanian President I. Iliescu in an interview for the Writers' Union weekly ROMANIA LITERARA.

Commenting on the 13 June events in Bucharest, the Romanian leader said that they are a component part of a whole series of actions whose clear purpose is to destabilize the political situation in the country. It is a question of a very major game in which both internal and external forces are involved. According to available data, officials of the former security service "Securitate" also played a part during these events.

Responding to a question concerning his own ideological sympathies, I. Iliescu declared: We have broken off from totalitarian practice and communist ideology not only in words, but in actual fact. I do not think that the reform

of communism and the appearance of "communism with a human face" is possible. For me this question was clear a long time ago.

Speaking about the future of the National Salvation Front, the Romanian President observed that the FNS [National Salvation Front] must reject a rigid party structure, remain a political formation that is broadly open to various strata of the population and a movement that fights for the moral improvement of society.

I. Iliescu cited official information concerning the number of victims of the December revolution. All told, 1,033 persons died, most of these were in Bucharest—540.

West Europe

Further on European Community's Delor's Visit

Ryzhkov, Delors Give Dinner Speeches

PM2307160990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Jul 90 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "USSR-EC: Readiness for Cooperation"]

[Text] A dinner was given in honor of the president of the CEC [Commission of the European Communities] on behalf of the Soviet Government in the evening of 19 July.

N.I. Ryzhkov and J. Delors exchanged speeches.

N.I. Ryzhkov's Speech

Mr. President and Mrs. Delors,

Ladies and gentlemen,

Comrades!

The first visit to Moscow by the CEC president is undoubtedly a significant event. In greeting you, Mr. President, as head of the supreme legislative organ of the EC, we are simultaneously addressing, as it were, the 12 EC member countries—the FRG, France, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, Luxembourg, Britain, Denmark, Ireland, Greece, Portugal, and Spain.

The emergence in West Europe of an economic union of states whose population totals more than 300 million reflects a steady trend in the economic development both of these countries themselves and of the world economy as a whole. It is a trend toward increased interdependence and the maximum utilization of the advantages of the international division of labor and all-embracing economic integration.

Soviet perestroyka was born of our country's historical natural laws and has its own roots and its own basis. At the same time it asserts principles and approaches which remove obstacles to extensive communication among peoples and states and efface from the map of the world the borders of military-political confrontation. Therefore a profound organic interconnection exists between the policy of new thinking proclaimed by perestroyka and the strategy of European economic integration.

For a long time it was considered that the centralized and administratively managed model which had become established in the Soviet Union was not capable of interacting constructively with the West's economy based on market relations. But the time has come, and the perestroyka of this model has begun. The placing of the Soviet economy on a market economy footing makes possible extensive and efficient cooperation with West European countries, thereby giving the all-European process a solid material base.

Thanks to the efforts of the Soviet Union and the EC and largely thanks to the personal efforts of the Commission president, the foundations have been laid for constructive relations between the Soviet Union and the Community. They have concluded an agreement on trade and on commercial and economic cooperation, which has undertaken the mutual granting of most-favored-nation status in trade and its greatest possible liberalization. It represents an important moment in mutual rapprochement between Eastern and Western states and strengthens faith in the possibility of Europe's unification. This is also served by the CEC president's visit to our country, and we hope that it will initiate our regular contacts and give a boost to the further strengthening of businesslike, mutually advantageous relations between the USSR and the EC.

This conclusion also follows from the results of today's meeting between the president of the Soviet Union and the CEC president, which had the nature of a constructive political dialogue, as well as the talks with you, Mr. President, at the USSR Council of Ministers. The exchange of opinions, which took place in an atmosphere of trust, was marked by a considerable coincidence of views on fundamental questions of world politics and the situation in Europe.

It is a very important fact that, while following different paths, you in West Europe and we in the Soviet Union are together arriving at an awareness of a single truth: The growing interdependence of states rules out the use of military force as a political means and makes it necessary to observe a balance of interests and to approach existing problems not from a position of rivalry but from a position of cooperation.

This inspires hope that West European integration will not lead to a new demarcation in Europe but, on the contrary, will promote the building of the common European home, in which, in addition to the Soviet Union and East European countries, the United States and Canada will also participate. This will be a formation with political and economic structures which will be able to ensure lasting peace and the all-around rapprochement of the peoples of our continent.

The upcoming meeting of heads of state and government of 35 countries will be an important landmark in all-European building. The Soviet Government has advanced a number of major proposals for the all-around deepening of the CSCE process and the creation of all-European security structures on the basis of transforming NATO and the Warsaw Pact. We reckon that these proposals will be supported by the leading organs of the communities and the EC member countries. We in turn are ready to examine very attentively any alternative variants which serve this goal.

But even the most perfect system for ensuring political stability would not be strong enough unless backed up by a corresponding economic base.

We are perfectly aware that it will take time for the Soviet Union to be able to be incorporated fully into the system of trade and economic ties that constitutes the framework of West European integration. But it would be a historical mistake to be inactive while waiting for that moment. The Soviet Union greeted with great satisfaction the decision of the Dublin meeting of EC member countries' heads of state and government with regard to holding consultations with the Soviet Government on questions of giving practical support to the policy of perestroyka. We perceived it as a manifestation of the community's good will and readiness to actively promote the success of the economic transformations in the USSR.

Of course, perestroyka is, above all, the business of the Soviet people themselves, and no one but we ourselves will resolve our problems. But the Soviet people value highly the readiness to help us directly or indirectly, morally or materially. And so the results of the Western political leaders' meetings in Dublin, London, and Houston elicit good feelings in us, and the Soviet leadership is making a careful study of the initiatives advanced at those meetings. The peoples of Europe and the world can rest assured that the Soviet Union will make a proper response to peace-loving and friendly initiatives.

Addressing the Dublin meeting, you voiced confidence, Mr. Delors, that "the Soviet Union will be able to create a market economy quite quickly, without losing the social features which have become a factor of worldwide development: social justice and rational economic planning."

Precisely this is the goal set by the policy of perestroyka. We are faced with difficult work in achieving it, but we look with hope to our country's tomorrow and reckon that it will bring a new era of unity and cooperation.

My talks with you, Mr. Delors, inspire optimism that the great potential of cooperation between the Soviet Union and the EC can be realized and will serve the good not only of the Soviet people but also of the peoples of all European countries and the whole world.

Allow me to propose a toast to the CEC president and Mrs. Delors!

To the health of all those present!

J. Delors' Speech

Mr. Prime Minister, Mrs. Ryzhkova, Messieurs Ministers, Messieurs!

Allow me to thank you, Mr. Prime Minister, for the welcome given us and for the substantive talks which my staffers and I have had with representatives of the Soviet Government.

How many events have occurred over the past two years! After many years of estrangement and alienation the EEC and CEMA have finally recognized each other, diplomatic relations have been established with the USSR, and then an agreement was signed between the EC and the USSR on trade and on commercial and economic cooperation, which you have just mentioned, Mr. Prime Minister.

We are getting more difficulties every day, but our hopes are also increasing. At the beginning of this week the four victor powers were able to reach agreement with the two Germanys on the peaceful settlement of the unsolved problems left over from the end of World War II.

We hope to create a greater Europe which remains true to the roots of its history, a Europe which becomes a great space of peace, prosperity, and exchanges, since there is no finer word than the word exchanges. Exchanges in international relations and in European relations mean not only exchanges of goods, exchanges of services, exchanges of capital. Exchanges also mean people's freedom of movement and the free expression and discussion of ideas which might lead to a diversity of thoughts. This diversity and this freedom constitute the strength and wealth of Europe, and we must rediscover this strength, never forgetting the need for diversity.

In my view, it is impossible to build this greater Europe by starting from scratch, from nothing. We must take account of history, of the cultural, economic, and technical ties which have become established in the European economic space over the past 40 years. We must take account of the ties established within CEMA and within the six European Free Trade Association countries and of the ties among the 12 EC countries which have decided to share their fate and to have a common destiny.

As regards the EC, this is an unprecedented example in history. Six countries, then nine, 10, and 12 agreed to have a common destiny and to give up part of their sovereignty to the Community because they realized that each country individually is incapable of fulfilling its responsibilities and satisfying its own needs and the search for independence, peace, and well-being.

The EC's founders were motivated by very simple ideals, and I believe that no one can understand this ideal better

than the Soviet people, because no one in history has suffered more than the Soviet people. The ideal is this: Let there never again be war between us. The EC was created on these foundations. And this design can apply to all European countries. It is possible to say: Let there never again be war between us, and I will add—let there never again be even a "cold" war between us.

The EC has experienced successes and failures, difficult and good moments. But this EC has enabled all its member countries to develop very quickly in recent years. Every Community member country has been able to surmount the obstacles that have arisen in its path. And there have been many obstacles. There was the oil crisis, international currency disorder, and the emergence of strong new industrial powers which threatened Europe's living standards and level of well-being.

All this was made possible only thanks to firm political will and awareness of our economic interdependence and the commonality of our destinies. In this we proceeded from three basic principles. First: to reconcile rivalry and competition. On the one hand, rivalry was very important because, as it developed, our spirit of risk, boldness, and enterprise developed and we gained in strength. And as cooperation developed, we arrived at an understanding that not only the market exists in the world because, if you think only about the market, you will not embark on the correct path. And so we endeavored within the framework of cooperation to strengthen our common policy in the sphere of technology, research, currency, and social policy. And this is very important. Such solidarity has been manifested in the fact that poor regions in our Europe have received assistance from rich regions. If it were not for the EC's solidarity and cohesion, the Community would be jeopardized.

The second principle is to reach agreement, as far as possible, on the removal of all barriers and restrictions on exchanges. This is on the one hand. On the other, we had to adopt at least minimal regulations governing the market, because without them it cannot operate fairly and correctly.

The third principle is to respect the diversity of nations and peoples, because the EC's political desire is to unite the peoples and associate the nations.

We will continue traveling this path on the basis of the same principles. We will endeavor to improve the EC's political integration and will strive for a single currency, because it will enable us to take our proper place in the world and make it possible to counter the currency disorder which is to be observed in the world.

We will continue traveling this path and will continue the EC members' cooperation in the sphere of foreign policy and security. And whenever we are faced with common interests, we will speak with one voice because we strive for political, currency, and economic union and want to act cohesively and consistently.

Messieurs, if I have plagued you with such a long speech, this is accounted for by the importance which I attach to the cause of strengthening the EC and creating a greater Europe, i.e. the common European home.

It is only within the EC framework that it is possible to resolve certain problems and difficulties and to dispel certain fears created by the unification of Germany. It is only within the EC framework that we have been able to begin giving assistance to central and East European countries. We have started with Poland and Hungary. But this aid will be given to other countries too.

I quite intentionally draw a distinction between the countries of central and East Europe and the Soviet Union, because I realize that relations with the Soviet Union must be special, because the Soviet Union was, is, and will be a very great power.

To judge from the results of the first meeting of the Mixed Commission, the agreement signed on trade and on commercial and economic cooperation makes available to us a great potential, which is accounted for by the Soviet Union's tremendous human and raw material resources.

The political decision adopted unanimously in Dublin and the confirmation of political support for the cause of perestroyka give a new boost to these relations, and we must be worthy, be equal to this new boost.

Maybe we are better able than other countries to understand and assess your difficulties because, despite all the difference of scale, our country experienced similar difficulties after World War II, when we had to modernize industry, when we had to abandon the state system in industry, centralism, and bureaucratic administration and switch to other areas of industrial development.

I know that you possess tremendous human, political, and natural means to overcome difficulties. You possess tremendous resources, and you have a very clear goal—to switch the Soviet economy into the world economy. But you are, of course, the sole lords and masters of your own destinies and decisions. This is perfectly obvious and clear. We EC members can make our contribution and cooperate with you to promote the transformation and adaptation of your economy. We can travel with you at least part of this road which must lead to the transformation of your economy. We can also travel part of the path which must lead to the establishment of internal political structures concerning union, i.e. we can cooperate with you on the path which, all in all, must lead you to greater well-being and to peace.

Wishing perestroyka every success, I raise my glass to the health of Mrs. Ryzhkova and Mr. Prime Minister and to the health of all members of the government and I pass on friendly greetings to the Soviet people.

The dinner passed in a friendly atmosphere.

Visit Goes 'Beyond Framework'

PM2307130990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Jul 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Report by A. Suvorov: "Jacques Delors' News Conference"]

[Text] At the 20 July news conference for Soviet and foreign journalists which ended the first visit to our country by an EC Commission chairman, Jacques Delors arrived in Moscow... very belatedly. When the long-term agreement on trade and commercial cooperation between the Soviet Union and the EC was signed in December last year, an accord was reached on a February visit. Then the Soviet side asked the visit to be rescheduled for May, J. Delors could not come in May, so July it was. But this time the saying "every cloud has a silver lining" was more appropriate than ever.

Now, in July, the EC Commission chairman's visit has gone far beyond the protocol framework and has acquired qualitatively new content. The European Council summit session held not long before in Dublin, in discussing the question of possibilities of rendering large-scale economic and financial aid to the Soviet Union, did not reach a definitive decision and instructed the EC Commission to study the question in greater depth and to prepare its own recommendations for the council's extraordinary session, which it is planned to hold in Rome in October. This approach was also supported at the meeting of the leaders of the seven leading Western states held soon after in Houston. Thus the EC Commission chairman received a second "mandate" for his trip to Moscow.

The course of the visit and J. Delors' meetings with the USSR president and the head and ministers of the Soviet Government have been widely covered in the press. Full emphasis was placed on the significant nature of the visit and of the actual fact of the establishment of direct relations and practical cooperation between the Soviet Union and the EC.

All this and the growing hopes of building Europe as a unified space of peace and prosperity was talked about a lot in the official speeches and at J. Delors' news conference. The EC Commission chairman stressed that an important result of the visit was the establishment of personal contacts with the Soviet leaders, making it possible to familiarize himself with their vision of the processes taking place in the country and their concepts of a future Europe.

Against this background the mission envisaged as the EC Commission chairman's second "mandate" was as it were out of the focus of general attention. Of course, it is not exhausted by one visit. We will be visited by more EC experts who have already been promised an opportunity for the broadest discussion and access to the necessary information. In his replies to journalists' questions on this topic J. Delors was both frank and diplomatic. In one reply he mentioned "requests for aid emanating from the Soviet Union." Obviously feeling this did not chime with our official thesis that "we are asking for nothing," he corrected himself: The word "aid" is inappropriate, it is a case of cooperation.

At a request to comment on his previous statements on the intention of some Soviet republics to introduce their own currencies, J. Delors replied that all available experience of federations assigns questions of security, finances, and the army to the central authorities. In addition a single currency makes it possible to operate effectively on the foreign market. Hence the conclusion that at the present stage this step by the republics would have destructive consequences.

Answering a question from a Ukrainian newspaper correspondent as to whether his republic can, albeit in the remote future, count on joining the EC, J. Delors cited the "golden rule" adopted and observed by members of the EC: respect for each country's sovereignty in resolving domestic problems. "President Gorbachev has announced a reform of administrative and economic relations between the center and the republics," the EC Commission chairman said. "As soon as this reform has been implemented we will be able to analyze the situation. So far we only known that we have one partner—the Soviet Union."

Latin America & Caribbean

Cuban Debate on 'Loyalty to Ideals' Viewed

PM1707143790 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 15 Jul 90 p 3

[Dispatch by TASS correspondent V. Kulikov: "Bastion Ready for Storming: What the Cuban Communists Are Bringing to Their Fourth Congress"]

[Text] Havana—The gray silhouettes of horsemen in sombreros, waving machetes over their heads, rush toward an unseen enemy. A color contrast is provided by a scarlet slogan, as though oozing blood: "Our motherland's future is an eternal Baragua!" Posters with such symbolism can be encountered everywhere in Cuba today—from the pediment of a government establishment to a hut in a mountain village. They have become a kind of "calling card" of the fourth congress of the Republic's Communist Party, scheduled for the first half of next year.

Baragua is a settlement in the east of the country. It is renowned as the place where, in 1878, Cuban national hero Antonio Maceo rejected the so-called peace pact of Zanjon, concluded with the Spanish colonists by his former comrades in arms. "After 10 years of war against what was in those days a most powerful empire, when the country was devastated, Antonio Maceo proved capable of expressing in Baragua his determination to fight until victory," Fidel Castro reminded thousands of his compatriots gathered for a rally in Havana's Central Park at

the beginning of this year. The country's leader drew an analogy with the present situation in which Cuba finds itself.

This idea seems to have caught the imagination of many of the Caribbean island's inhabitants. At the frequent rallies and demonstrations in the republic in support of the Communist Party line, people can be heard to say that, under conditions when "socialism on the planet is suffering a most serious setback and imperialism is preparing a new pact of Zanjon on a world scale," every Cuban will fully display revolutionary courage and loyalty to the ideals.

And the congress, according to the plans, is expected to demonstrate to the foreign public this universal readiness for exploits and the people's cohesion around the revolution's banner.

I am leafing through a brochure published in Havana containing the text of an appeal for the communists' fourth forum. The keynote idea of what is essentially the precongress party platform is: "not a single step back from socialism, Leninism, and internationalism."

What specifically does this mean? The document provides unequivocal answers on this score. In the economy the "fundamental principles of socialism" will remain unchanged: public ownership of the means of production, centralized management and planning, state control over the distribution sphere, emphasis on moral labor incentives. In the political sphere the principles of a one-party system and of the Communist Party's leading and directing role will continue to be professed. In the past, incidentally, F. Castro has repeatedly emphasized that the existence of several parties does not certainly signify democracy. We also know of his arithmetical calculations according to which a multiparty system provides loopholes for unscrupulous politicians, who can get elected head of state by winning "fewer than 25 percent of an electorate's votes—which does not give them the right to govern a country in the name of an entire nation."

At the same time, to judge from the document, the further dissemination and deepening of "the original experience of socialist building in Cuba," which was acquired during the years since the revolution and has "begun to play an increasingly decisive role in revolutionary ideology," require special attention. It is a question of those aspects of Cuban society's life which the country's leaders use most frequently as counterarguments to parry the enemy's most "perfidious" ideological attacks. It is a question, first and foremost, of "the highest form of democracy in the world, in which the government does not fear its own people and gives them weapons to defend the country in the event of foreign aggression." Second, of "a high standard of education, health care, and social security—which, together with providing the population with the essential minimum of consumer goods and basic foodstuffs at low prices, guarantees a worthy life for all sections of Cuban society."

Thus, the leaders of the PCC [Communist Party of Cuba] do not hide the fact that they intend to continue taking the path of rectification—the Cuban version of perestroyka undertaken in 1986 in response to Soviet perestroyka which is, essentially, its opposite. The chief feature of rectification remains reliance on the people's revolutionary consciousness and enthusiasm. At the same time elements of war communism are being preserved and may even be intensified—the ration system of distribution, the combination of production activity with training in the military skills within the framework of a concept of preparing for "nationwide war," etc.

However, it is hardly possible to predict unequivocally Cuba's future destiny as the "bulwark of orthodox Marxism," as many people in the West do. Thus, the appeal by the republic's political leadership to all compatriots to develop a lively, critical, and interested discussion of the pre-congress party platform came as a surprise to many foreign analysts this spring. It was announced that this debate would take place according to the principle "from bottom to top": first at open meetings in primary party cells, with residents of nearby city districts invited to them, and only then at plenums of municipal and provincial party organizations. "This is the first such nationwide discussion of questions submitted for examination at a party congress," the party newspaper GRANMA wrote at the start of the debate. "The significance of the upcoming forum consists in the fact that it will touch on all or, at least, the main aspects and criteria designed to orient us in implementing revolutionary changes." The appeal was called a basis for interpreting and seeking acceptable alternatives.

The open nature of the preparations which have begun for the party forum undoubtedly accorded with the slogan "The PCC is the party of the entire people," which has been put forward in the republic as a kind of reply to Western critics' charges of a lack of political pluralism on the island.

At the same time, in confidential conversations with ordinary Cuban communists, the author of these lines has heard that at certain meetings in April the "people from the street" who were invited—housewives, pensioners, students—took literally the appeal to boldly share their opinions and were sharply critical of party organs for red tape and abuses of power, interruptions in supplies of food and consumer goods, and the poor operation of everyday services and transport.

In keeping with a new thesis, the appeal is already being discussed "from top to bottom." Plenums of provincial party committees, the Young Communists Union, the Central Organization of Cuban Trade Unions, and other public organizations were held in June. Following such approbation from above, it was once again promised to conduct the debate in primary organizations. The

republic leadership gives an assurance that the original idea remains in force—a program for the further improvement of socialism in Cuba enriched by the collective reason of millions is to come into being as a result.

CPSU Greets Colombian Party on Anniversary

PM1807095190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Jul 90 Second Edition p 1

[CPSU Central Committee undated message congratulating Communist Party of Colombia on its 60th anniversary]

[Text] To the PCC [Communist Party of Colombia] Central Committee

Dear Comrades!

We cordially congratulate the PCC on the 60th anniversary of its founding.

Soviet communists know about the PCC's struggle for social justice, democracy, and peace in Colombia and revere the memory of the Colombian comrades who gave their lives in the name of these lofty goals.

We value your support for the CPSU's policy of restructuring Soviet society, which is intended to impart new strength to socialism and really reveal its humanist potential.

We express confidence that friendship and solidarity between the CPSU and the PCC will continue to strengthen.

The CPSU Central Committee.

28th CPSU Congress

Marxist Platform's Buzgalin Views Congress

PM2307150190 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 20 Jul 90 Second Edition p 2

[Interview with A.V. Buzgalin, member of the CPSU Central Committee and senior lecturer of the Moscow State University Economic Faculty, by correspondent N. Garifullina, place and date not specified, under the rubric "Postcongress Discussion": "Reasons for Optimism"]

[Text] [Garifullina] It has happened: A representative of the so-called "minority," that is, the Marxist Platform in the CPSU, was elected a Central Committee member at the congress. I think that this fact alone is convincing confirmation of the democratization of the party itself and the deepening and irreversibility of this process. How do you rate the results of this congress, Aleksandr Vladimirovich?

[Buzgalin] I shall start with what I disliked during the congress' work. Yes, the congress tried to move forward in conditions when the country is standing on the brink—and that is no hyperbole, that is the real situation. But with a few exceptions I sensed no understanding of the degree of strain or depth of the crisis in the delegates' speeches. In these conditions a few steps in the democratization of the party will hardly satisfy communists completely. Yes, a step has been taken in the direction of democracy: Representatives of the Leningrad Initiative Congress and the Marxist Platform have been elected to the Central Committee and a candidate from the Democratic Platform was nominated; but nevertheless I still think that a platform quota must be established for the representation of the minority in the supreme organs.

There was also a sense of dissatisfaction at the fact that alternative documents, particularly those on the government's economic program which were presented at the congress, including those from our platform and a section of the Leningrad Initiative Congress, were not even examined during the elaboration of the program statement. Certain theses in the decisions could be open to more than one interpretation, including the decision on the joint-stock form of ownership. In my view, they may be just a cover to enable the old bureaucracy from the ministries and top echelons of the leadership to move to the offices of joint ventures and joint-stock companies, thus exchanging "power for money, power for property." Labor collectives were effectively left without worthwhile guarantees of self-management. What form the democratic control of the market from below will take, from the consumer unions, trade unions, and other mass democratic organizations, is still completely unknown. The sense of being the master is supposed to be developed solely on the basis of the lease and shares, but that path is acceptable only to a few, not to the majority of working people.

At the same time, the congress took a number of steps along the path of democratizing the party and overcoming the crisis. This is undoubtedly a pleasing phenomenon. The fundamentally important point for us Marxists is that the 28th CPSU Congress Program Statement "Toward a Humane, Democratic Socialism" said with the utmost clarity that the CPSU is the party of socialist option and communist outlook, and there had recently been a fierce struggle on this point. This enables us to work in the framework of the CPSU, equipped with the fundamental strategic guidelines elaborated at the congress.

Finally, the position of a number of delegates with whom my colleagues and I met inspires a definite optimism. These are people who intend to really revive the communist movement from grassroots level, to establish informal work by communists in labor collectives, and to that end to encourage working people to defend their own interests and ensure production self-management, modern forms of labor organization, and real social justice.

[Garifullina] How do you view the action strategy of rank-and-file backwoods communists today?

[Buzgalin] In fact I have already mentioned some aspects. I will add that when working in the heart of the masses a communist must strive to ensure that workers at an enterprise or farm and inhabitants of a town or settlement are not passive "subjects" but become the real owners of production and the housing stock and work with the authorities in resolving problems of the environment and the population's supply with goods and food. All this is a sphere of activity for communists where they can initiate the revival of the democratic movement, unity among people, and people's struggle for their rights and for real guarantees of stable living standards in the conditions of the future, semibureaucratic market economy which will become the dominant form if not today then tomorrow. At the congress I sensed the readiness of a considerable section of delegates for such day-to-day work, and this inspires a sense of optimism.

[Garifullina] The 28th CPSU Congress Program Statement says: The CPSU sees its task in being the party of civic consensus and ensuring constructive cooperation among various sociopolitical forces interested in overcoming the crisis and securing the democratic restructuring of society. Is the Marxist Platform ready for such cooperation?

[Buzgalin] The congress itself showed not only the possibility but also the fruitfulness of forming a left, democratic wing within the party. The fact that a section of the Democratic Platform has gone is more a positive than a negative aspect for the party, because they have different ideological positions. On the possibility of the direct borrowing of Western structures we differ categorically from that section of the Democratic Platform and with Lysenko, who believe that a civilized economy and a

civil society are all that we need. There is another section which subscribes to the socialist option but which regards the communist outlook as irrelevant. That is where we disagree fundamentally with them, too.

[Garifullina] But what about questions of ownership? Incidentally, Shostakovskiy said in his speech that the forms of ownership did not matter to him...

[Buzgalin] We believe that ownership must be first and foremost social and must prove that it is more efficient than private ownership. It is necessary to create really equal conditions because today state enterprises have greater protection but economically speaking have far fewer opportunities than the private operator. Furthermore, state ownership remains bureaucratic and fully under the control of the director or minister. But in our view it should belong to the labor collective. This must be the power of the labor collective, the power of social democratic organizations, and for that it is necessary to create a new mechanism of relations between the center and the localities as partners, on a businesslike basis.

[Garifullina] You spoke about the possibility of forming a left wing in the party. What does this concept entail?

[Buzgalin] I would say that this is a wing which consistently favors the democratization of the party within the framework of the socialist option. In addition to Marxists this will clearly be a section of the reformist communists in the Democratic Platform. Furthermore, we intend to hold a series of consultations and continue contacts with supporters of the Leningrad initiative congress on economic questions. We are interested in their alternative program for the switch to the market economy. In brief, I would like to stress that we are ready for cooperation and are open to all. But we resolutely oppose those who do not recognize the socialist option and aim to liquidate the party, just as we oppose all attempts to restore neo-Stalinism or the Brezhnevist system as a form of the country's positive development. We boldly join informal organizations, believing that communists simply must do that and pursue CPSU policy there.

[Garifullina] At the moment communist deputies are divided in the soviets and do not present a united front—as, incidentally, was glaringly obvious at the First Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies. And there are even calls for soviets without communists...

[Buzgalin] If it is the case that soviets are trying to outlaw the mass party, then it is necessary first and foremost to look at ourselves. How is that we, the ruling party, with hundreds of thousands of full-time personnel, a budget of R2 billion, and a monopoly at least in the mass media have reached a point where they are "asking" us to leave the soviets? Whose fault is that? To a large extent ours and our leadership's. It is necessary to begin with an act of cleansing, with a critical and sober analysis and consideration of the situation that is developing. If we go into opposition, adopt an "intransigent posture," and do nothing, we will lose. That is a further path toward crisis. We must learn as quickly as possible how to work in uncomfortable conditions and undemocratic organizations. Lenin had to work in czarist conditions and even managed to work in the czarist Duma, where communists were howled down. It is important for us not to adopt an offended pose, not to repeat our mistakes, but to act and act again. If we are worth anything, if we are real communists then we shall win, come what may. Otherwise we will be crushed. We have to win through our ability and professional qualities. That's putting it starkly.

[Garifullina] Recently there have been too many prophets of doom appearing in the party, foretelling its rapid demise...

[Buzgalin] I have never shared the view that Marxism and the communist movement is dying away. A section of the party is still incapable of understanding that without a rapid, consistent, and resolute debureaucratization, the party will really find itself in an extremely dire situation and the crisis will deepen. I have always said that, and I repeat it now. But I have also said before and am repeating now that there are communists capable of reviving our movement from below, within the masses. As a scientist, I can see: The conformist wave which developed from the beginning of perestroyka but which was born in the years of stagnation has now begun to overwhelm the party. The best that the majority can do is dispute and issue declarations. But as far as I can tell they still cannot work constructively for the party's revival without waiting for orders from above, or determine their own position in an ideological conflict of views or find like-minded people. They haven't learned how, they aren't accustomed to it. It was precisely that kind of person that the administrative-command system ought to have molded and, unfortunately, did mold. But there is a positive aspect, too. Any dictatorship produces an opposite wave, that is, people who are ready to struggle against it and defend democracy and socialism. Such people entered the party and are in it today, and we must rely on them, because only they are capable of dragging the country out of the quagmire into which we have all been drawn. Such people exist outside the party, too, many of them among the young. We must rely on them.

Congress Delegates Polled on Attitudes

PM2307152990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Jul 90 First Edition p 4

[Report by Doctor of Philosophical Sciences V. Boykov and Candidate of Philosophical Sciences Ye. Levanov under the rubric "Congress Sociological Service": "Were Hopes Vindicated?"—first paragraph is introduction]

[Text] Let us offer the 28th CPSU Congress delegates, who were polled by the sociological service several times in the course of the congress, the opportunity to answer this question.

Moscow—Everyone has obviously heard how sharp the debates inside the Kremlin walls were. It is also true that halfway through the congress only 10 percent of the 2,103 party organization envoys polled 6 July expressed satisfaction with the initial results of the forum. Special resentment was provoked by the reports of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo members and candidate members and CPSU Central Committee secretaries and by the absence or insufficiency of constructive proposals in other speakers' speeches. This was demonstrated by the fact that more than half (54 percent) of respondents pinned responsibility for the country's bad life wholly on the party leadership, which made itself felt in the elections of the new CPSU Central Committee. One in three delegates noted the uncomradely, impolite character of the debates on the questions discussed.

The delegates' main concern, as research showed, was man, the realization of whose vital interests is the essence of perestroyka. However, delegates did not reach this conclusion at once. The precongress poll of them indicated that the majority (62 percent) were especially worried by the state of affairs in the party, and only 34 percent of respondents were troubled by people's social protection. For the sake of comparison we point out that, according to the statistics of a precongress poll of the population, only 22 percent of people were worried by the state of affairs in the CPSU, whereas one-half were worried by the decline of social protection.

By the end of the congress' work this discrepancy between the concerns of the delegates and those of the people had disappeared.

As is well known, the CPSU Central Committee Platform, the Democratic Platform within the CPSU, the Marxist Platform, and other platforms were elaborated during the precongress debate. An overwhelming majority of delegates rallied to the CPSU Central Committee Platform, which acquired its final form in the 28th CPSU Congress Program Statement "Toward Humane, Democratic Socialism," having first "absorbed" hundreds of amendments.

Many provisions of the CPSU action program adopted by the congress not only were brought fully into line with renewed legislation but also open up full scope for initiative by party organizations. It is no accident that 65 percent of the delegates polled were satisfied with the program statement, only six percent expressed serious disagreement with it, and the rest agree with some things and disagree with others. Even greater solidarity was shown on the adopted CPSU Statutes, which were supported by 68 percent of respondents.

No, there is no complete unanimity or, as it is now customary to say, consensus. But, to be honest, it is difficult to imagine that people who have rejected the market economy for decades and who have not begun to believe in its necessity even now would vote for a transition to the market without second thoughts. And it is hardly worth branding those who believe that in moving toward the market we are not moving toward the realization of socialism, but are betraying it. And 25 percent of delegates polled believed this.

Many delegates took the diametrically opposite standpoint. Justified reproaches over the party's lagging behind the perestroyka of society provoked in these a sort of allergy toward all traditions. At the same time the possibility of the party becoming isolated from the people lies not only in adherence to the past, but also in the putting forward of tasks that society is not ready to solve. Take the following fact. According to the statistics of a poll of the population carried out in May of this year by the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences Sociological Research Center, the majority of people supported a transition to the market economy, but half of those polled believe at the same time that a rationing system for the distribution of goods, the very antithesis of the market, needs to be introduced. The same contradiction in public awareness can be seen across virtually the whole spectrum of economic, social, and political problems, as well as in relation to the CPSU. The majority of people criticize it extremely sharply. But a critical disposition is displayed not only toward the party. The prestige of virtually all institutions of power—central and local state organs and trade unions—and of economic leaders, etc., is falling. Alarm is growing in society owing to the fact that people find themselves in the situation of orphans. Asked who is able to defend the interests of the "ordinary" person, a question put to the population in June of this year, 53 percent of respondents replied that they do not rely on the help of the soviet, law-enforcement, and numerous other organs and organizations. Their interests are as yet still lost in political battles and economic disarray.

The congress' decisions inspire hopes of changes for the better. The feeling of hope is reinforced by the position of the majority of delegates. Eighty-three percent of those who took part in the polls are in favor of the party moving toward the left and becoming younger. Eighty-one percent support strengthening ties between party organizations and the working people. At the same time more than half believe that the threat of a weakening of the unity of party ranks and even of a split has not been overcome. In this respect, the fact that a significant proportion of the delegates consider the most important thing in strengthening the CPSU to be not the consolidation of all the currents within it, but the "surgical" cleansing of the party of those who stray from the general line is a cause of concern. Thus 34 percent of respondents on the concluding day of the congress insisted that the party be rid of people whose belief in the ideals of socialism has wavered, and 21 percent that it be rid of conservatives.

The congress gave a boost to enriching our concepts of the ways of renewing the party. Its leading organs were elected on the basis of democratic procedure. The essential thing is not to squander this potential, as has happened before. Practical action alone can cause hope to supplant the remaining doubts as to success.

Report Details Congress Delegate Data

90UM0749A Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 29, 21-27 Jul 90 p 3

[Report by the Main Political Administration of the Soviet Army and Navy: "Whose Generals Are They?"]

[Text] Communists of the Armed Forces were represented at the 28th CPSU Congress by 269 delegates. All of them had been nominated by local party organizations and were elected on a competitive basis (out of 5,794 candidates). The body of delegates included 170 generals and admirals, not 241 as was reported by USSR People's Deputy Colonel A. Tsalko to the INTERFAX press agency (ARGUMENTY I FAKTY, No. 28 of this year), 93 senior officers, one junior officer, two warrant officers and one ensign, an employee of the Soviet Army, and a worker.

About 50 percent of the delegates were representatives of the command personnel, 32 percent—political workers, and 12.5 percent—communists of the staffs, rear organs, and engineering and technical personnel. Also elected were four workers of the military commissariats and a legal expert.

Almost 40 percent had been elected delegates of preceding CPSU congresses and the 19th All-Union Party Conference.

In the first round of voting, 87 percent of the delegates were elected. The support of the majority of participants in the party conference was given to Comrades D.T. Yazov (94 percent), M.A. Moiseyev (80 percent), N.I. Shlyaga (85 percent), and V.N. Chernavin (91 percent).

As compared to the preceding party forums, at the 28th CPSU Congress in the body of delegates from the Army and Navy the representation of the central staff of the USSR Ministry of Defense decreased by a factor of three, management personnel of the main and central administrations and branches of the Armed Forces—by a factor of two, division commanders—by a factor of three, and chief of division political sections—by a factor of seven.

At the same time the representation of secretaries of party committees increased by 63 percent.

OFFICIAL STATISTICAL DATA OF MILITARY RANKS AMONG DELEGATES TO THE 28th CPSU CONGRESS (Soviet Army and Navy, Ministry of Internal Affairs, KGB)

Marshals of the Soviet Union—two, marshals of branches of the service—one, Army generals—16, colonel generals—50, lieutenant generals—73, major generals—71, admirals of the fleet—one, admirals—six, vice admirals—seven, rear admirals—four, colonels—79, lieutenant colonels—48, majors—26, captains—one, captains first rank—four, captains second rank—four, senior lieutenants—three, warrant officers—one, ensigns—two; TOTAL—399.

Political & Social

Revenko Views Union Treaty Drafting Issues

LD2407124390 Moscow TASS in English 1232 GMT 24 Jul 90

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Isachenkov]

[Text] Moscow July 24 TASS—The basic principles of a new Soviet Union treaty are to be worked out this August or September and the treaty itself is to be drafted by the end of the year, Presidential Council member Grigoriy Revenko told a news conference here today.

But he did not rule out the possibility of the work taking a bit longer, continuing into early next year.

After the powers of the centre and of the republics and their joint responsibilities have been tentatively set, the draft treaty will be put before the republican supreme soviets or to vote at republican referendums, Revenko said.

Following the ratification of the Union treaty and the republics' treaties with the centre, the Union's founders will form its central agencies, he added.

Revenko did not deny the possibility of some republics refusing to sign the treaty. He hoped, however, that the suggested format of differentiated relations between the centre and republics would make it possible to find satisfactory solutions for all.

Revenko said the drafting of the treaty and the creation of a market economy should proceed together, as they are two sides of the same coin.

Asked if the programme for changing over to a market, which the federal government should submit next autumn, may violate republics' rights, he said that any dictates from the centre are out of the question. The government programme will emphasise the economic freedoms of individuals and the independence of enterprises, Revenko added.

He denied rumours that Eduard Shevardnadze clashed with Mikhail Gorbachev during the joint meeting of the Presidential Council and the Federal Council last Friday. Revenko claimed he did not hear Shevardnadze say that the treaty in the making ignores the rights of republics.

Shevardnadze, according to Revenko, was speaking about the basic principles of work on a Union treaty and said that it was a complex problem that should be resolved gradually.

Voicing his own opinion, Revenko said that even if a founding republic of the Soviet Union declares itself non-socialist, it quite possibly could remain an integrated member of the Union of sovereign socialist republics.

"We ought today to give up abstract arguments about ideas, we should think about the state. If we become fixed on the notions 'socialism' and 'capitalism', we can lose a great deal," he said.

Before joining the Presidential Council, Revenko led the Kiev Regional Communist Party Committee.

Gorbachev, Top Leaders Hold 'Working Conference'

LD2307160190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 23 Jul 90

[Text] Today USSR President Gorbachev had a working conference to develop accords reached at the last joint session of the Council of the Federation and the Presidential Council of the USSR. Participants in the conference exchanged views on mutually dependent processes of the transfer to the market and the creation of a new Union treaty.

Taking part in the conference were: Maslyukov, Primakov, and Yakovlev, members of the Presidential Council; Khazbulatov, first deputy chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet; Silayev, chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers; Pavlov, USSR minister of finance, and Fedorov, RSFSR minister of finance.

Speaking at the conference, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev stressed the need to agree on positions and for close cooperation between central and corresponding departments of the RSFSR.

New Party Leaders Air Current Issues

LD2407070290 Moscow TASS in English 0642 GMT 24 Jul 90

[Text] Moscow July 24 TASS—Four new members of the Soviet Communist Party leadership answered numerous questions, including angry ones, from television viewers during a direct call-in session on Monday.

The four—Deputy General Secretary Vladimir Ivashko, Politburo members Aleksandr Dzasokhov and Galina Semenova and Central Committee Secretary Valentin Kuptsov—appeared on a new Soviet television programme "Who Is Who. Political Dialogues."

They called on the country's diverse public forces to discard confrontation for the sake of dialogue, cooperation and mutual tolerance.

Ivashko, who is charge of the Central Committee secretariat and the party's social and political activity, described as a great achievement the adoption by the 28th party congress of documents encouraging progress towards democracy and new relations among people. He said the task now was to turn these achievements of the congress into tools in the hands of each party member, Ivashko stressed.

Galina Semenova described graphically what caused political passions to flare up. Society which had long been in slumber, she said, eventually awoke to troubles and shortages. It started yelling. Now the time has come to act constructively. The feelings hurt in the past must not lead new politicians to wrath, she warned, because anger can hinder constructive decision making.

However, while conducting dialogue, the party must define precisely what it views as unacceptable for our society, Vladimir Kuptsov said. He is in charge of relations between the Party Central Committee and public and political organisations and movements.

For instance, communists are radically opposed to the chauvinist right-wing of the Pamyat Society. The communist party will cooperate with all those who favours the socialist option. It is now establishing such contacts.

Aleksandr Dzasokhov, who will be responsible for ideological activity, said he viewed as ill-timed discussions relating to renaming the party in connection with theoretical debates concerning the plausibility of the communist perspective. It is not the name but the party's policy that matters, he said.

The discussion of the matter at this point when the party is under fire, can be viewed by some as the revision of its basic principles.

Ivashko said that the party's reuunciation of economic management functions should not be regarded as the rejection of the party's active involvement in pursuing its social and economic policy.

In order to create pre-conditions for the successful implementation of its policy, he said, it is necessary to focus on making the new party rules effective.

Interior Ministry Spokesman on Ethnic Unrest

LD2007141190 Moscow TASS in English 1404 GMT 20 Jul 90

[Text] Moscow July 20 TASS—The situation in Armenia remains tense. Clashes between terrorists and representatives of law enforcement agencies took place in various areas of this Transcaucasian republic on Thursday, a USSR Interior Ministry spokesman told TASS.

In Yerevan, the capital of the republic, a group of militants attempted to force their way into the building of the Internal Affairs Department of Myasnikyan district. The attackers withdrew only after the militia fired warning shots.

A traffic inspector post in Yerahavan settlement in Ararat district was set on fire and burnt down.

A traffic inspector post at the Echmiadzin District Department of Internal Affairs was also fired upon.

In the same district, a group of armed people seized weapons from militia and state security personnel. As a result of measures taken, the weapons were retrieved.

In Ashtarak District, a 30-member group of terrorists attacked a traffic inspector post. Bandits tried to blow the post up but the attempt was thwarted by a group of traffic inspectorate personnel of the republican Interior Ministry.

In Talin District, bandits set off an explosion, damaging the building of prosecutor's office. According to the USSR Interior Ministry, no one was hurt. Personnel of the internal affairs department in the same district discovered an explosive device planted in their building.

On July 18, 120 armed people forced their way into the building of the Internal Affairs Department of Vardenis District. They demanded arms and 180 cars that were on flat cars at the railway station. Militia managed to get them out of the building.

On the same day an armed crowd with similar demands blockaded the Militia Department at Masis station. They were dispersed only with the aid of Interior Ministry troops that arrived there in armoured personnel carriers.

Tension has not subsided in the Osh region of Kirghizia, a Soviet republic in Central Asia. According to the USSR Interior Ministry, clashes between Uzbeks and Kirghizes continued in the city of Osh on Thursday. Ten people applied to medical institutions over the past 24 hours. An apartment house was set on fire.

In the town of Kara Su, a militia patrol, when inspecting a car belonging to a local Uzbek resident, found a hunting gun, a small-bore rifle, 37 cartridges and a combat grenade.

An explosive device was hurled at a militia patrol in the same town. Luckily chance that none was hurt. [sentence as received]

Since Thursday, 26 firearms were taken from the population of the region, and 180 people were detained for curfew violations.

Ligachev Intention To Write Memoirs Noted

PM2307153790 Moscow TRUD in Russian 21 Jul 90 p 4

[From the featuren"We Answer Readers' Questions": "And Now for His Memoirs?"]

[Text] "It is known that Yegor Kuzmich Ligachev, former CPSU Central Committee Politburo member, is out of a job after the 28th CPSU Congress. But how does he intend to occupy himself?" (V. Olenina, Moscow).

Unfortunately, the editor was unable to ascertain the following through official channels. But according to a report from our AFP colleagues, Yegor Kuzmich, having suffered defeat in the election to the second most important party post, intends to travel to his homeland of Siberia, to visit Tomsk, where he worked for a long time and the countryside where he was born, and after that to get down to writing his memoirs, in which he intends to reflect our political life and his work in the Central Committee over the last five years.

In the West it has long been the norm for retired politicians to share their reminiscences with the public. So far only the memoirs of N. Khrushchev and A. Gromyko are known here.

Democratic Leader Moves Against Moscow Party

LD2307113190 Moscow World Service in English 1100 GMT 23 Jul 90

[Text] One of the Democratic Platform leaders in the Soviet Communist Party, Vyacheslav Shostakovskiy, has taken court action against the Moscow City Party Committee for dismissing him from the post of Moscow Party Academy rector as unsuitable for the post. Shostakovskiy demands that legality of such dismissal be considered and his professional honor and human dignity be protected.

Shostakovskiy was discharged in the wake of a statement he made on behalf of a group of communists at the 28th party congress. The statement referred to dissassociation with the conservative part of the delegates, a division within the party, and intention to form from part of it an independent democratic parliamentary party.

Democratic Platform Faces Financial Difficulties

LD2007223890 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2100 GMT 20 Jul 90

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] The Democratic Platform movement has found itself in a difficult financial situation. The coordination council of the movement has called on those who support the Democratic Platform to stop paying their CPSU dues, and to donate one percent of their salaries to the Democratic Platform.

Disunity of Democratic 'Informals' Lamented

PM2307154090 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA RPAVDA in Russian 22 Jul 90 p 1

[S. Sokolov article: "No Consensus Among Comrades..."]

[Text] It seems that even the "informals" are "carpeting" each other, and those who err are "told off" and given a "democratic reprimand." That is what was done by the coordinating council of the Moscow Voters' Association immediately after the July rally and demonstration on Manezh Square, which caused such a stir; it reprimanded N. Promokhov, an activist from Zelenograd, for his "provocative speech." In the same way the Moscow Voters' Association, together with members of the organizing committee to prepare the rally, censured the ultrarevolutionary speeches of Moscow City Soviet Deputy V. Fadeyev, Democratic Union member

V. Novodvorskaya, and RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] People's Deputy T. Koryagina, whose efforts tend toward a split in the country's democratic forces. Few people know that the rally, which was held so unexpectedly and to the tune of cries of "Down with the CPSU," was in fact supposed to have been the finale to the founding conference of the Union of Democratic Forces, which did not happen. The conference has been postponed to the end of August. But the rally showed convincingly that it will not be very easy for the democrats to unite.

Journalists dispersed with an equally unreassuring diagnosis after the press conference of the "Democratic Alliance," which is the brainchild, or rather the fruit of the imagination, of four organizations—the Democratic Party of Russia, the Free Labor Party, the Social Democratic Party, and the Constitutional Democratic Party. At the moment, three things are known about the alliance's general plans. First, they have announced that they will meet regularly, on Tuesdays. Second, as parties of the "nonsocialist choice," they intend in the near future to set about forming a "shadow" cabinet and seeking the election of a new, coalition government on a multiparty basis. And, third, although the alliance is supposed to unite all left-wing forces, for some reason other parties and democratic associations are in no hurry to join it.

"And indeed, on what basis will we unite with these parties," Lev Shemayev, member of the Moscow Voters' Association coordinating council, explained, "if the first time the alliance 'distinguishes' itself it does so with a statement calling on the developed states not to grant credit to our poorly off country?"

But the reluctance of liberals, radicals, reformers, and other leftists to understand each other is characteristic of Russia. At least, that is the view of the American political scientist Alexander Yanov, who recently visited the USSR. Knowing how the lack of a strong left-centrist coalition in Russia in 1917 ended, Yanov noted with deep regret that the same disorder and vacillations are in evidence now.

In fact, the democrats do not want to unite. And that is a pity.

Council of Ministers Food Commission Session Held

PM2307111590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Jul 90 Morning Edition p 1

[Unattributed report: "In USSR Council of Ministers"]

[Text] A session of the USSR Council of Ministers commission for food and purchases has been held. There was a discussion of a wide range of questions connected with organizing the country's food supplies under the conditions of market relations. The session examined and approved draft programs on the gasification and electrification of the countryside, the provision of autonomous engineering systems and equipment for rural apartment blocks, and the development of the production of foods for young children in 1991-1992 and the period through 1995.

Officer Alleges KGB Knew of Katyn Massacre

PM2307142290 London MOSCOW NEWS in English No 8, 20-26 Jul 90 p 1

[Unattributed report: "KGB's Katyn Cover-Up"]

[Text] A KGB officer claims in a letter to MOSCOW NEWS that the massacre of Polish troops at Katyn was never kept a secret from the Soviet spy service.

In his letter, Major Oleg Zakirov, who is stationed in the Smolensk region, questions the KGB's support for Gorbachev and calls for the nation's highest court, the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, to probe its working and administration.

His claim comes embarrassingly close on the heels of assertions by KGB Major-General Oleg Kalugin that the state security committee is still spying on Soviet citizens and remained unaffected by glasnost. Kalugin was stripped of his state awards and decorations after making his allegation on Soviet TV.

Major Zakirov insists that the Katyn massacre was never kept a secret from present KGB chief Vladimir Kryuchkov, nor from Major General Shiverskikh, chief of the Smolensk KGB.

"In the ocean of glasnost there still exists an archilpelago of non-glasnost, intolerance and arbitrariness. This archipelago is the KGB," he writes.

"Kryuchkov's claim that he is in the 'same trench with Gorbachev' is greatly exaggerated. Karpovich and Kalugin, the men who dared to wash KGB dirty linen in public, have been stripped of their awards. But the former Vice Chairman of the KGB, Abramov (now deputy procurator), who baited Andrey Sakharov, and Major General Shiverkikh, chief of the Smolensk KGB, who tried to suppress the Katyn tragedy and who is still savaging subordinates and permitting the flats of staff to be searched without the procurator's sanction, remain honourable security men.

"The measures taken against Kalugin actually sanction reprisals taken against staff members who want perestroika to be accelerated within the KGB. The facts cited by Kalugin must be investigated by the Supreme Soviet and once the results of the investigation are complete, it must be decided whether the entire leadership of the KGB shouldn't resign."

Oleg Kalugin is to stand for election to the Supreme Soviet as member for Krasnodar. The vacancy was caused by the resignation of Ivan Polozkhov, who has become first secretary of the Russian Communist Party.

Lawyer Attacks 'Spirit' of Draft Law on KGB

PM2007155690 Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 29, 17-23 Jul 90 pp 28-29

[Professor Valeriy Savitskiy article: "Is the KGB a Threat?"—first paragraph is introduction]

[Text] The KGB submitted to the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Defence and National Security a draft law on... itself, that is, on how it would like to be depicted in strictly legal terms. The draft was transferred for a comprehensive study to the USSR Institute of State and Law. NEW TIMES asked Professor Valeriy Savitskiy of the Institute to comment on this:

Our institute has given a sharply negative assessment of the draft pointing out that it needed further improvement. First of all, it is necessary to change the very concept of the draft. The current version gives the KGB extensive, even unrestricted, prerogatives, making it a state inside the state, shrouded in secrecy. The draft makes no mention of the necessity of respecting the rights, honour and dignity of citizens, although in the not too remote past, the KGB itself was used as an instrument of brutal suppression of dissent.

I cannot comment on each article of the draft law here. But it is not even individual articles, but the spirit of the document that matters. Instead of narrowing functions and prerogatives of the KGB, which I believe is necessary, the KGB tries to secure colossal power in its hands.

Why for instance, should the KGB, organization responsible for intelligence and counterintelligence, undertake the investigation of various offences, including criminal ones, replacing the organs of the Interior Ministry and the Procurator's Office? Investigation must be the responsibility of a special body under no departmental influence, and a corresponding decision has already been adopted by the USSR Supreme Soviet. To withdraw investigation from the KGB framework means to increase control over it on the part of the Procurator's Office and, in some cases, the Supreme Soviet. At the same time, this measure will remove excessive concentration of power in the hands of the KGB.

It could seem that there is nothing wrong with that "the KGB, within the confines of its competency, shall render assistance to organs of the Interior Ministry and other law-enforcement agencies of the USSR to combat crime and maintain order in the country" (Article 13). However, this formula is very dangerous because it will allow the KGB to step in any time someone fancies that order must be protected (from demonstrators? workers on strike?). In general, the KGB's involvement in internal affairs depressingly dominates the entire draft law.

It is known that legal acts binding on all institutions, organizations and individuals may be passed only by Soviets on all levels, the president of the USSR, the governments of the Union and the Union republics. The authors of the draft decided to add the KGB to the list, although with one reservation "within the competency given to the KGB" (Article 17). But perhaps we better leave legislative functions to legislators?

The issue of certificates and references on the requests of state bodies and public organizations is an inherent responsibility of all departments, which provides for normal functioning of the state apparatus. But not of the KGB. Point 8 of Article 17 of the draft says the KGB has the right (not the duty!) to present exposes on citizens who are to be allowed access to state secrets, request Soviet citizenship, intend to go abroad, etc.

If it is only a right of the KGB, then the KGB can act arbitrarily giving out references, certificates and exposes on its own accord.

The paragraph stipulating the people's duty to cooperate with the KGB in matters concerning national security and combating crime evokes serious doubts. If it is a juridical duty, then it must carry juridical responsibility. As a consequence, people will have no choice but to cooperate. Will this reanimate the terrible practice of denunciations? In any case, this paragraph will not help reduce the number of informers.

One hopes that at the upcoming parliamentary hearing, deputies to the Supreme Soviet will thoroughly study each paragraph of the draft law. Only people's deputies can protect the privacy of citizens from all kinds of overt and covert shadowing and eavesdropping. After it is discussed in the appropriate parliamentary committee, the draft law must be presented for a national discussion.

MVD Department Head Discusses Weapons Control

90UN2197A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 6

[Report on an interview with Anatoliy Churzin, head of the Authorization Department of the Main Administration for Public Order and Safety of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, by S. Mostovshchikov; place and date not specified: "Prohibitions of the Authorization System"]

[Text] **IZVESTIYA (Issue No. 127) has already reported that the Soviet militia has relinquished its control over duplicating and copying equipment which came under the so-called Second Department of the Main Administration for Public Order and Safety of the USSR MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs]. This department is now known as the Authorization Department, and for about six months now it has been headed by militia Colonel Anatoliy Churzin. He intends to bring some changes to his department to free it from uncharacteristic responsibilities. To end control over the copying equipment was just a first step. The IZVESTIYA correspondent asked A. Churzin to share his plans with us.**

[Mostovshchikov] Anatoliy Ivanovich, the very name of your department should in theory make one feel optimistic: It is an authorizing and not a prohibiting service. But the way I see it one cannot exist without the other; if

you have the right to allow things, that means there is a system of banning them also...

[Churzin] Well, not a system of banning... I would rather call it a system of limitations. Yes, it does exist, and it covers purchases, storage, usage, transportation, and sales of weapons, ammunition, poisonous and radioactive materials, and explosives. And our purpose is to make this system of limitations work.

All this work is done by six people from the Second Department of the USSR MVD's Main Administration for Public Order and Safety, as well as by the heads of the authorization systems in the republic ministries of internal affairs, by 2,000 full-time inspectors, and by the precinct militiamen who do practically all the basic work. In total we keep about 230,000 locations under control. That number includes 157,000 institutions where weapons are in permanent storage (two thirds of these are schools and DOSAAF [Voluntary Society for the Promotion of the Army, Aviation, and Navy] organizations), and 5,000 explosives depots. We also have about 3.2 million individuals registered who own about 3.6 million hunting rifles. Together with the environment protection organizations we try to prevent poaching as well as violations of hunting regulations. The authorization system also has control over printing shops.

[Mostovshchikov] Do you consider the existing limitations system as normal? Do you think it reasonable?

[Churzin] You know, there are different opinions expressed now. Take weapons, for instance. Some people think they should be sold free, others want to stop both their production and sales. I personally do not support either point of view, but it seems to me that you cannot ignore them. If the people start talking about a problem it means that the problem exists. Now we are witnessing the appearance of gas pistols in our country which some people bring from abroad. There is no mention of them in the law. And another thing: Firearms are sold on the "black market." I think it would have been reasonable for our leaders to define clearly what is allowed now and what is not.

However, this is a problem for our legislators. But as for the system of control, I can talk about that. In my opinion we need it in one form or another. Weapons should not be used for committing crimes; therefore we must make sure that they do not end up in the wrong hands. And what about poisons, explosives, radioactive materials? They should definitely be safeguarded.

[Mostovshchikov] That is clear. But this is a mystery to me: What is there in common between an explosive, for instance, and an official seal? And even an ordinary rubber stamp? As far as I know, you are the ones who still issue permits for the production of rubber seals.

[Churzin] I do not quite understand this myself. This is how it works at present: For instance, you registered your cooperative, a joint venture, or a party with the local power organs. Then you have to go to the militia to get the permit to have your rubber stamp made. No shop will agree to make it without our approval. Why do we need all this red tape? Why should several agencies deal with one problem? It seems that we do not trust the Soviet power. I think it is sufficient to get the permit from the Soviet power. Even if someone starts using the rubber stamp where it should not be used, let him be held responsible according to the law. Otherwise we end up making people stand in lines one extra time and we ourselves have to do extra work. It is the same story, by the way, with poisonous, explosive, and radioactive materials.

[Mostovshchikov] But you said there was no problem with those...

[Churzin] This is not quite right. The thing is that we deal more with issuing all kinds of permits than with the actual control. Take, for instance, an explosives depot. Somebody needs to take out so many tons of explosives necessary for some kind of work. He has to go to the militia for a permit. And the rayon department chief usually issues the permit although he does not have any special knowledge enabling him to understand what kinds of materials are being taken out and for what purpose. Neither has he any possibility to control the cargo safety during its transportation and during the work conducted on it. But we have experts in Gospromatomnadzor [State Inspection for Nuclear Energy in Industry] or, in the case of poisons, experts in the Minzdrav [Ministry of Health] and Minkhimnefteprom [Ministry of the Petroleum Refining and Petrochemical Industry] who can provide the necessary control perfectly well and without any help from us.

In my opinion, we need to preserve only the militia's control over the dangerous materials. That is to relieve the militia of the permit issuing procedure but hold them responsible for the safety of storage facilities for the poisonous, radioactive, and explosive materials. We are prepared the check the guards, the alarm systems at the depots, etc.—this is reasonable.

[Mostovshchikov] Tell me, do your proposals find support in the Ministry of Internal Affairs?

[Churzin] Before we propose these ideas officially we need to find out the opinions of the organizations involved; we need to have a serious conversation with them, which is very important. Recently they published the draft Law on the Soviet militia so that it can be discussed. This document does not outline any serious changes in the work of the authorization system. But being at the head of it I would like, naturally, to see my suggestions taken into account.

Dismantling of Nuclear Submarines Protested

LD2107210890

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1500 GMT on 21 July broadcasts a four-minute report

by correspondent Vyacheslav Zdorikov from Sovetskaya Gavan Gulf on the dismantling of nuclear submarines in the gulf. He says that "the inhabitants of Sovetskaya Gavan have voiced a demand to declare the shore of the Tatarskiy Strait a nuclear-free zone. Yesterday, 20 July, a demonstration of labor collectives and the public of the coastal town took place." Zdorikov says that the Sovetskaya Gavan gulf is the widest and most convenient point on the USSR's Pacific coast for vessels to moor, and staff officers of the Pacific Fleet have selected one of the bays in the gulf as a dumping ground for obsolete nuclear-powered submarines.

Zdorikov says: "Representatives of the Pacific Fleet headquarters visited Sovetskaya Gavan this spring, and decided that disassembly of nuclear reactors could be carried out here. The inhabitants of the town and region heard about these plans, and naturally no one could remain indifferent to them. A wave of protest swept the town, culminating in a demonstration at the Zavet Ilyicha housing estate in Sovetskaya Gavan." Valeriy Ivanovich Kulik, chairman of the estate soviet of people's deputies, said at the meeting that all the inhabitants of the region are being turned into hostages. A well-considered program for eliminating nuclear weapons on earth must be drawn up and implemented, and the citizens of Sovetskaya Gavan must campaign for that, he adds.

Zdorikov observes that not all those at the protest meeting heeded Kulik's call for moderation: "Very many people are currently susceptible to radiophobia, a fear of radioactive contamination, and these people, blinded by terror, resort to the most extreme measures." For instance, Zdorikov says, a chief petty officer serving on one of the decommissioned nuclear-powered submarines was not allowed to speak at the meeting. He tells Zdorikov that the Greens Party had on 16 July picketed the checkpoint and prevented personnel from entering the base. This is the ugly form in which people are campaigning for the ecological purity of Sovetskaya Gavan, Zdorikov says.

Senior officers of the Pacific Fleet are indefinite as regards their plans, Zdorikov points out. "No sooner has it been decided to dismantle nuclear submarines here in Sovetskaya Gavan than suddenly a statement by Admiral Gennadiy Ivanovich Khvatov, commander of the Pacific Fleet, appears. The issue of salvaging nuclear vessels has never been raised by the fleet command, and is not on the agenda. It is a complex engineering problem, the solution of which is technically impossible at the indicated base area. Such contradictory reports from the fleet command indeed compels the inhabitants of Sovetskaya Gavan and the adjacent areas to come out with fresh protests against the plans for dismantling nuclear vessels in Postovaya Bay. It only remains to be hoped that this will never come to pass," Zdorikov says.

Roundtable Discussion on Trade Unions Examined

904F0205A Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
30 Jun 90 Second Edition pp 5-6

[Report by S. Pastukhov and Ye. Sorokin on PRAVDA roundtable discussion on trade union movement hosted by I. Frolov: "Trade Unions in a Changing Society"]

[Text] **Preparing for the 28th CPSU Congress, PRAVDA has conducted in its offices a series of meetings with representatives of various categories of workers in the country. These have been meetings with workers and peasants, soviet workers, the creative intelligentsia and scholars, women, the military, youth, and so forth. Trade union workers and activists attended the tenth and final pre-congress meeting.**

Participating in the meeting were: V. Borodin, chairman of the Central Committee of the Trade Union of Workers of the Chemical and Petrochemical Industry; V. Gruzintsev, sailor for the Kamchatrybprom Production Association, member of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the Trade Union of Fish Industry Workers; M. Ignatenko, chairman of the Krasnopolskiy Rayon Committee of the Trade Union of Workers of the Agroindustrial Complex (Mogilev Oblast); V. Korzhov, chairman of the Leningrad Oblast Trade Union Council; V. Kuzmenok, chairman of the Central Committee of the Trade Union of Fish Industry Workers; N. Malakhatkina, deputy chairman of the Federation of Independent Trade Unions of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic]; M. Ramazanov, deputy chairman of the Karaganda Oblast Trade Union Council; G. Sukhoruchenkova, secretary of the AUCCTU [All-Union Central Trade Union Council]; S. Shkurko, director of the scientific center of the AUCCTU; A. Yakunova, chairman of the shop committee of the Kolkhoz [collective farm] imeni Kirov, Balashikhinskiy Rayon (Moscow Oblast); and G. Yanayev, chairman of the AUCCTU. Also participating in the meeting were O. Losoto, PRAVDA political editor, and Ye. Arapov, chief of the AUCCTU press center.

The meeting was conducted by the secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, PRAVDA Editor-in-Chief I. Frolov.

[Frolov] We have given our final meeting with you, esteemed colleagues, this name: "Trade Unions in a Changing Society." We have earmarked a number of issues about which we can perhaps conduct our discussion with you. But this should in no way discourage anyone present from raising his own pressing problems. Well, here is an issue. It pertains to the so-called general agreement among trade unions and the government concerning the most important socioeconomic issues and is now being proposed as one of the instruments with which the trade unions can fight for the interests of the workers. Quite recently a new formation appeared in the arena of our social life—the Federation of Independent Trade Unions of the RSFSR. PRAVDA readers are

interested: On whom does this federation depend? What principally new aspects does it bring to the trade union movement?

Experience shows that during discussions very heated arguments sometimes break out. This is good, the meetings must be conducted in a free manner. We have no regulations here. Please, who would like to begin.

[Ramazanov] I represent a mining region which was most heavily hit by strikes. I can state firmly that they shed light on all the negative factors that have appeared in the trade union. And the miners expressed their attitudes toward the trade unions simply: In this stage they are not protectors of the workers' interests. In many collectives the mistrust was expressed both toward trade union activists and the trade union movement as a whole.

Naturally, the question arose: What should we do now to change things? They began with the local party organizations. The coal miners' trade union in all regions developed new platforms and regulations with the goal of reflecting all of the miners' aspirations. This, of course, was necessary work but it did not reveal the full depth of the tasks of the trade unions. Based on this, as you will recall, a coal miners' congress was held at which the debates were heated—to express a lack of confidence to the government, to outlaw the part ... And as a result they got away from purely trade union work, the discussion was not about this specific work. It was decided to shift it to the lower organizations and then bring it up at a second miners' congress in order to determine once and for all: What is a trade union and how should it protect the workers' interests?

And what is life like now? Our regional trade union organization is, by virtue of its structure, an oblast trade union council which unites all 14 branches in our oblast. But the functions of the oblast trade union council have now changed somewhat. For example, it recently signed an agreement with the ispolkom [soviet executive committee] of the oblast soviet of people's deputies for the social development of the region. Previously the ispolkom raised these questions from year to year and from five-year plan to five-year plan and adopted certain plans for socioeconomic development but then during the course of its work diverted its funds in some unknown direction, to certain industrial facilities, and the social sphere receded into the background and ultimately was not developed.

But now, according to the agreement that has been concluded, the trade union will check to make sure that the social plans are unwaveringly fulfilled. This is just our first step but it is not our last. Debates are now being waged: What should the branch trade union be—should it be defined by occupation or by some other indicator?

The trade union should have rights. But for some reason the Supreme Soviet has not yet adopted the Law on Trade Unions, on the basis of which we could construct our protective functions.

We must work jointly, on an equal basis, with the local soviet authorities and with the party. We must work to protect the interests of the workers. That is, we must not separate in this stage.

[Kuzmenok] It seems to me that Comrade Ramazanov has expressed the key idea: What are trade unions and how should they protect the workers' interests? Everything begins with this. Unfortunately, we have ended up in a situation where trade union activists of all ranks must begin their work precisely with this. What is a trade union? Why does it exist? We have developed a more or less clear position. We cannot say that this position is shared by all of our trade union of millions of fish industry workers. This would require that they know this position and "digest" it. Therefore now I am speaking only about the position of the management organs.

In our view, the trade unions should engage in something in which nobody else and no other organization can engage. If we begin to duplicate the work of the soviets, the party, and so forth we will not be a trade union. Then we will lose the workers. Therefore it seems to me that the trade unions are organizations of workers united for the purpose of the most advantageous sale of a specific commodity—labor. The main distinguishing feature of such a specific commodity as the work force is defined by one concept—the "trade union."

But in the country we have 40,000 occupations and these are just the main ones; should we therefore have 40,000 trade unions? But this is impossible. It has developed historically that we have joined into so-called branch trade unions. So if one agrees with the idea that the trade unions serve to enable a person to sell his labor on the most advantageous terms, everything falls into place. And we immediately understand why for 70 years our trade unions have not been trade unions but something else.

Why? Because in the form of the state we had one monopolistic buyer of labor. When something is monopolized the normal trade process is violated. The state, being a monopolistic buyer of labor kept the trade unions on a short leash. And, naturally, it is disadvantageous for us if the monopoly in the form of the work giver, that is, the buyer of labor, continues. There must be many buyers, if I may put it this way, there must be "buyer pluralism."

Yes, strange as it may sound, this is advantageous for the trade unions. Only then will we be real trade unions. On the other hand, monopolies on the part of the trade unions are also disadvantageous for us, that is, if all the trade unions were to be united into some kind of super trade union such as the AUCCTU is now and monopolistically worked against certain property owners. Then they, the property owners, would again unite and we would end up with the same stalemate that has existed throughout the past decades. Two monopolies: One sells labor and the other buys it. Naturally, the state as the strongest buying monopoly subjugated the seller.

I think the branch trade unions will start to decrease in the future. There are many directions or paths for this decrease. In the first place, there will be alternative trade union structures—they already exist. In the second place, while previously we automatically drove all workers of the branch into the trade union, now we will have to get away from this.

We must prepare for a situation where there will be no equal sign between the number of workers and the number of trade union members. Today 95 percent of our workers, including ministers, are trade union members. But if we look into the future we will base our actions on the number of trade union members and not on the number of workers.

And if we are to speak about our trade union, at a recent plenum we created seven occupational sections determined more specifically by the occupations. This is approximately the same situation that the miners have. Their underground workers want to break off into a separate trade union. We have the same problem with seafaring personnel. Now that these sections have been formed we hope that our trade union will operate on a federative basis among these sections.

[Yanayev] We must give answers to two questions. The first: Are the existing trade union structures, while expressing the interests of the workers, capable of finding the most effective forms of protecting these interests and satisfying them? Second: Will the existing structures make it possible to carry out this task? I think that the task derived from these two is linked to a determination of the rapidly changing sociopolitical situation and the role and scope of the trade unions in the country. At the Sixth AUCCTU Plenum last September we should have declared that the trade unions are released from functions that are not natural for them. Up to this point they have done everything—from taking the collective mushroom picking to burying people. Everything was included within the competence of the trade unions. But they should have singled out the main link with which we could have pulled the entire chain. This link is the protective function of the trade union, the protection of the socioeconomic and spiritual interests of the workers.

Having declared this, the trade unions should have spoken about their new position in society. They declared themselves independent of state and sociopolitical organizations and of any political party. When I speak of independence from the party I do not mean that we are breaking relations with the party, that we want to take the now "fashionable" position and thus somehow increase the authority of the trade unions. No!

It is all a matter of the fact that the country is proceeding toward a multiparty system. Therefore the degree of "political engagement" with respect to one political party or another should be determined by the way the platform of one party or another corresponds to our idea of social justice, the protection of the workers' interests, the raising of their standard of living, and so forth. And in this stage we state that the CPSU Program and the CPSU Platform with which the CPSU goes to the 28th congress give us the opportunity to arrange partnership relations precisely with the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. I am not yet analyzing the party-political platform of other social formations, but I will say that the party, having proclaimed perestroyka and its main goal of raising the workers' standard of living, is acting in accordance with our ideas of the future destiny of society. It is another matter that we have achieved little so far, but there are no alternatives to perestroyka and ultimately we will carry out its initial task as formulated five years ago.

The trade unions should have discussed the principles of our relations with the government. Up to this point, making joint decisions with them, we have approved practically any undertaking whether it was popular with the people or not. We were simply a convenient partner for the government. But under current conditions, if we still want actually to express and protect the interests of the workers and trade union members, we must formulate in a new way the principles of relations with the government and other organizations of state and economic control. We have declared that the trade unions will be a constructive opponent of the government. But this does not mean that we will take every occasion to latch on to the government and try to trip it up. If a government program is reasonable, if it serves the interests of the workers, we will support this program.

The trade unions are in favor of the workers and businesslike relations with the government. At the same time, if its platform, program, or any concrete economic or social decision contradicts our ideas of social justice and protection of the workers or encroaches on their interests, we will announce our disagreement with the government. As we will retain the right to defend our view, taking advantage of the entire arsenal of forms and methods at our disposal, including extreme measures.

The trade unions are responsible for the fate of the country. Therefore, when the government program for changing over to market relations was being discussed we said that, on the one hand, we could object to market relations but on the other... After all, we have already tried to jump, as it were, in consecutive hops over the abyss to various economic innovations, trying to carry our economy with us. The result is a total deficit in the domestic market. Almost total. I think that of the 1,200 goods that are in daily demand there is a shortage of 1,150 of them.

When, on behalf of the trade union, I made a suggestion to the effect that before changing over to market relations we must conduct a referendum, people began to accuse me of vacillating: On the one hand, I was for the market and on the other, with the help of the people I wanted to strangle this market. No! A referendum must be conducted in order to obtain the conscious consent of the people. And in order to obtain it the government must clearly tell the people about the condition of our

economy, why the market is necessary, what we expect from it in a half year, a year, two years, or five years, that is, indicate the goal toward which we are striving. What will be the benefits and what will be the drawbacks? After all, we must not idealize the market, the market is a tough thing, especially in the initial stage.

There will be mass unemployment, which already exists. There will be inflation, super-inflation, and a drop in the workers' standard of living, and we already have 80 million workers on the verge of poverty. Do we really want to dump them into the beggars' pit? If this happens there will be social dynamite in the country and it could go off at any moment. If we are responsible for the fate of the country we must conduct a predictable policy and not one based on impulse. And therefore the most correct course in relation to the market is consultation with the people. And the main thing is that we must envision a system of social "amortizers," guarantees which would make it possible to nullify the possible negative consequences resulting from the change to the market.

Before changing over to the market the Supreme Soviet must enact laws which would guarantee the people social protection. These would include an anti-inflation law, laws on employment, on the minimum standard of living and the minimum wage, on indexing incomes of the population taking price changes into account, on material assistance and other kinds of compensation for individuals who have ended up in extreme situations, on regulation of labor relations, on trade union rights, and certain other social laws which today could give the people the necessary faith that they are not about to be deceived once again. In addition to the government program I think it is necessary to have alternative programs for changing over to the market. We would select the one which involved the least encroachment on the rights of the workers. For example, I consider the government's decision to include price increases in the same package with market relations to be quite wrong. After all, the market is not only and not so much a matter of increasing prices.

Such is the position of the trade unions. And people have begun to accuse us of socioeconomic demagogy, populism, and so forth. I must say that I am in favor of this kind of socioeconomic "demagogy" if it makes it possible to save millions upon millions of Soviet people from poverty, if it makes it possible not to leave single mothers, families with many children, pensioners, veterans of war and labor, youth, students, and people on fixed incomes to face the market alone. Yes, I am in favor of this kind of socioeconomic "demagogy." And, finally, why is it that as soon as the trade unions have declared themselves to be an unattached, independent force, certain representatives of the mass media, which did not lavish their attention on us previously, immediately started criticizing us—from left and right. Why is this happening? Independent trade unions are a bother to proponents of the administrative-command system who have become accustomed to having the trade unions proclaim the principle of "whatever you want." And here suddenly they are "independent," "unattached"...

Certain proponents of destabilization of the situation in the country do not like the trade unions, which are following a predictable, independent policy which is not on the left and not on the right but in the center. And the trade unions are now acting as the stabilizer, perhaps one of many, which makes it possible somehow or other to preserve peace in the country.

[Gruzintsev] What has perestroyka done for us, for our collective at our place? It has provided glasnost, information, and freedom of action. What does this freedom consist of? That the trade union committee may express its opinion and defend it before the administration and the party organization. Now, when there is "tension" in the country, is the time when the trade unions, at least in our collective, are keeping an explosive situation from developing.

We have always been in favor of honest labor. But we also want to receive a good return from it. Why are we not striking? We have done an analysis: What are we receiving and are we getting our share? Here is the problem: We are not striking, but the fleet is standing idle—there is no fuel. We do not believe that there is no fuel. There is fuel. And there have been rumors that the government, as it were, is sharpening its teeth on our trade union and the economic leaders who support the trade union. How else can this be explained?

When the first law on labor collectives came out our leaders and the trade union committee had a small safety valve. In three years they built 400 apartments for our workers. But here is the problem: Some 60 percent of our ships are over 15 years old. This means that in the future we can expect accidents in the fleet and so forth. I do not wish to denigrate any other branch by saying, for instance, that others have it easier. But our labor is probably the most difficult. The government, having published provisions on conditions for labor and recreation in 1960, doomed us fishermen to a 12-hour work day.

How do I envision the changeover to the market? What the chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers said in his speech means that we can get something for nothing. I have in mind raising prices and taxes. Take what you can get before the people figure out what is what. My mother is 70 years old and she tells about how the chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, Comrade Biryukov, came to Kemerovo Oblast. She was satisfied with the oblast: In the store there were three kinds of meat and five kinds of sausage... And this was on the Bolshevik Sovkhoz [state farm]. They say that the workers there were ordered not to come to the store! This was so that nobody would buy everything before the guests came.

[Question-Rejoinder] But how do you feel about the market and market relations? Do you think the people will support them?

[Gruzintsev] We are actually already conducting a market policy in our country, but here is the question: Will they be able to trade? Since the war we have been trading with the socialist countries to our own loss. And what normal businessman will trade if he stands to lose? Or take those same miners, the workers of Magadan, and all people in the highly paid categories. Look at what is happening. From the program proposed by the government it follows that subsidies will be paid to everyone except the miners and people like them. How? A miner earns R700 and in the draft of the government plan it is pointed out that there will be no subsidies for people who earn R700. Neither for groceries nor for industrial goods. Moreover, if you earn more than R700 you will pay an exorbitant tax. This kind of changeover to the market can again destroy the desire of a conscientious person to work. He will say: It would be better for me to earn R500 and then they will give me a subsidy and I will have less tax and I will be as well off as the advanced worker who works from morning until night.

[Ramazanov] I should also like to add this. We have a party organization at our enterprise—11 workers discharged from the party committee. They do not mine coal but they receive bonuses from the material incentive fund. Moreover, at the enterprise they have the best offices, telephones, and automobiles, and they do not pay rent...

[Question-Rejoinder] Murat Mirzayevich, may we talk now about the crisis of confidence of the working class in the party?

[Ramazanov] I myself became an apparatus worker recently, but I am one of the workers and I am responsible for my region in Karaganda: Yes, there is a crisis of confidence.

[Kuzmenok] There is a sailor in our midst. May we hear his opinion?

[Gruzintsev] At our base debates have been going on for a year and a half about the elimination of the position of first assistant to the captain or, to put it more simply, political officer. We must not think badly of all first assistants. Among them there are people who work hard for their money. Both the rank-and-file crew member and the captain can really open up to them. For example, the senior communist and war veteran, Viktor Matveyevich Parshikov. But there are also a lot of heartless bureaucrats. So on the whole one can say that our entire collective is against them. Why? There is a lot of communist arrogance and little work. And yet if the political officer is intelligent he can do a lot for the collective. I would think that the collectives themselves could best decide whether they need this position or not.

[Shkurko] Since we have touched on the question of confidence and the party I would like to begin with it. I recently returned from Kazakhstan and there I spoke not only with representatives of the trade union committees but also with members of the workers' committees. While in the trade union committees they still express their mistrust of the party more or less delicately, in the workers' committees they speak without diplomacy. That is by way of a reference. And taking into account the fact that we are now attending a meeting in the editorial offices of the organ of the CPSU Central Committee, I would like to note this. It seems to me that M. Gorbachev was quite correct in saying that there is such a thing as methodology and there is such a thing as method. We must preserve our positions in party methodology but we must get rid of its methods. In particular, the CPSU must state that it rejects the notion that the trade unions are a school of management, a school of control, a school of communism—this has bound the trade unions to the chariot of the party-state system of control. But the party remains silent, it is saying nothing. If it does not say this, the trade unions themselves will say it.

And now the question: Who are we—the trade unions? Obviously, we cannot declare ourselves to be protectors of the interests of the workers in the broadest general political sense since our Soviet state and the party and other social organizations all reflect the interests of the workers. Therefore the trade unions need their own specific interest that is inherent only in them—the trade union interest. And I can see it: It is the socio-occupational interest of the workers, the interest of labor. This is what V. Kuzmenok was speaking about. But I do not completely agree with him or perhaps even in general disagree when he says that this interest must be defined as an interest in selling labor better and more advantageously.

[Frolov] I would like to say a couple of words about this. In Japan I had occasion to meet with many trade union activists. They do not raise the question in this narrow sense of labor alone. The new forms of work, the so-called "high technology," take us out of the understanding of simple labor. The working man needs something altogether different from simply restoring himself as labor. I am not even speaking about the fact that in order to prepare oneself for participation in "high technology" processes one must be more than simply a person with labor. A person who is comprehensively developed is needed.

You see, in the capitalist countries they speak about the need to understand man as a kind of whole, a human individual. If we fail to recognize this and reduce everything to labor, then capitalism might get even further ahead of us in terms of humane treatment as well. I am afraid that we might lose what we had before even though it may not always have been realized. I do not know, perhaps I am wrong, but I object to the notion of reducing a human being to nothing more than labor. When our trade unions begin to reduce their activity to buying and selling and to the most advantageous sale of labor then when will they perform their social or, if you will, humanistic function?

[Kuzmenok] You have understood the sale of labor as an act with only one aspect. I was speaking of it in the

broader sense. That is, so that all the protective social functions are provided for at the same time, from birth to death...

[Frolov] There is another aspect we must not forget about either. The fact is that in the difficult current situation we are discovering what I would call poor political "qualifications" of many cadres, including in the trade unions. And not only trade union but also party and economic cadres. Much must be revised here. And if this is not done then, of course, there will be a total crisis of confidence in the leaders who will be essentially rejected both in the party and in the trade unions.

[Sukhoruchenkova] I have been working in the trade unions for a long time and therefore I can be so bold as to discuss whether or not the trade unions are fully taking advantage of the possibilities offered to them by perestroyka. I am convinced that this question cannot be answered in the affirmative. Today we are saying that the main function of the trade unions is protective. But they are still "working" poorly, especially at the lower levels.

After all, what is happening in our country today? We have changed our relations with the central organs and this is being manifested in everything. The previous dictatorship no longer exists. But at the level of the oblast party committee and the local party organization there is still pressure. And if all of this pressure could be eliminated the full force of the initiative and creativity of the trade unions would be unleashed.

It is precisely because of pressure from the party and economic organs that the trade unions do not have their own "face." And they are being attacked precisely because for many long years they were built in to the command system. This is why we are advising in favor of having the party, at its forum, emphasize the new relationship to the trade unions and say that it sees them as partners whose opinion they respect. The trade union is still basically the more democratic organization which is closer to the concerns and needs of the workers. Take, for instance, the Pioneer Camps. Should the trade unions be concerned about them?

[Rejoinder] Of course, is this not concern for the worker?

[Sukhoruchenkova] But some people would not agree. Because, after all, one can convincingly show that this is a matter for the state and so let the state take care of it. To be brief, there is much confusion in the minds of many trade union workers today. But what alarms me most of all is the fact that we are abandoning our conquests so lightly, referring to Western examples.

A couple of years ago but still during the time of perestroyka we received a high-level delegation from the German Trade Union Association. A meeting with the trade union aktiv and the workers was organized in Novosibirsk. Our comrades flooded the guests with questions: Do trade unions handle questions of labor protection in your country? And the organization of recreation for children? And the daily life of the workers? Somewhere around ten positions appeared, which comprise the essence of the work of Soviet trade unions but, as it turns out, are not included within the competence of our West German colleagues. And here is what struck me: Our guests began to ask one another the question: What essential matters do they themselves engage in?... No, there is no need for us to be oriented only toward the experience of the West. We too have something to teach people. But more should be entrusted to trade unions and they must be held more strictly responsible.

[Korzhov] I basically disagree with Galina Fedorovna when she says that the trade unions must be entrusted with more and held more strictly responsible. Is this again someone's dictatorship?

[Sukhoruchenkova] Of course I had in mind a dictatorship of the workers.

[Korzhov] That is a different matter. Today a tendency toward philanthropy or something is being initiated in the trade unions. In Leningrad, for example, pensions were raised two months before they were in the rest of the country—with trade union funds. About R10 million were spent on this. We are giving 70 million to underprivileged families, and so forth. Today life is forcing us to help people who are on the verge of poverty. This is why I think that the AUCCTU protests against making paupers out of the people were also generated by life itself. These protests showed that the trade unions really are shrugging off the baggage of obedience. Many even thought that the recently published draft law on social associations was a government reaction to the independent position of the trade unions. If this is so, the matter can go far. The more so since the Draft Law on Trade Union Rights has been "shelved." To no small degree it is the lack of this that is leading to the creation of alternative trade unions. Now, for example, in Leningrad we have several associations which also call themselves trade unions. They are "Independence," "Justice," "Liberation," and the "Center for Mutual Assistance to Workers." I am fairly familiar with their activity, I have met with their leaders, and this is the conclusion at which I have arrived.

If just yesterday extremist groups were, shall we say, fashionable, today the situation is different. The greater the extremism of these so-called "independent" trade unions, the lesser their chances of survival. Thinking, intelligent trade union associations are going into operation today. In Leningrad, in my view, they have work committees. They have been formed in places where the working conditions are difficult. They include workers in heavy machine building, the defense industry, light industry, builders, and automotive transportation workers. We see nothing bad about these associations. On the contrary, we are ready to cooperate with them. For what is the main thing? It is not a matter of the diversity of trade union movements but the creation in the region of a unified trade union center which could protect the rights of the workers.

[Rejoinder] The more so under the conditions of the market.

[Korzhov] Quite right. We conducted an express analysis recently. It turned out that from 65 to 70 percent of the trade union aktiv are in favor of the market but still from 85 to 90 percent are against the concept presented by Comrade Ryzhkov. Of course, we are in favor of the market, but under the condition that they adopt the package of laws discussed here by G. Yanayev and also a law on trade union rights. The situation is developing in such a way that if the Union Supreme Soviet does not adopt this law, we Russians will take it to the Supreme Soviet in our republic.

Just take this same Federation of Independent Trade Unions of Russia—the federation, of course, is independent...

[Frolov] I think it is time to turn the floor to one of the leaders of the Federation of Independent Trade Unions.

[Malakhatkina] What Vladislav Ivanovich Korzhov was just talking about is new to us. We frequently hear about the false independence of our federation. For some reason many people think that independence must come from "above." But what do we ourselves mean by independence in our federation? I will begin with the fact that the word "independence" should pertain primarily to our local trade union organization, that is, to the basic unit which today delegates all of our questions and functions. It is on these principles that our federation has been built. Today there are 315 people on the Federation Council. They have been nominated by the local organizations through direct delegation. Our Presidium, which consists of 64 people, was also elected this way. And therefore I think we must understand the word "independence" as the independence of the local trade union organization.

The local organizations today are so bogged down by commands from above that, as they say, they cannot go down any further. This pyramid must be turned upside down. The local unit should decide for itself which higher organizations it needs and which problems they should solve. Today the local organization should also handle budget problems.

These are the principles on which our independence is built. At the same time at the constituent congress held in March they actually did proclaim independence from state and economic organs and political parties. But while we defend the interests of the workers we must be indifferent to the parties to which they belong. Our main task is to unite all workers for the protection of their economic and social rights.

We consider the main direction and focus of our activity to be the need for a general agreement between the Federation and the Government of Russia, which should include all the main issues contributing to the social protection of the workers.

[Question-Rejoinder] Perhaps certain concrete steps have already been taken by the Federation?

[Malakhatkina] Literally a couple of days ago in Murmansk there was a conference devoted to problems of peoples of the North. More than 10 million people live in the North and their social conditions are extremely unfavorable. We think it is the trade unions that should help the northerners solve these problems.

And the last thing. When creating the Federation we made it a point not to adopt a decision to the effect that all 77 million trade union members on the territory of the Russian Federation today would automatically be transferred from one structure to the other. We considered it necessary for each to make a deliberate choice. As you can see, the constituent congress interrupted its work so that it could be continued in September when the congress delegates could discuss all the problems with the trade union members. But even now it is known that 50 percent of the trade union organizations of Russia have made a decision to enter our Federation.

[Ignatenko] Perestroyka has undoubtedly untied our hands—both the trade union raykom [rayon party committee] and the local trade union organizations. In order to improve the work of our local organizations I think that no less than 80 percent of the monetary funds should remain at the disposal of the trade union committees. Our staff in the trade union raykom consists of four or five people and there are very many problems to solve. Moreover our rayon suffered a great deal from the disaster at the Chernobyl nuclear power plant. We actually have no clear land and our children and our young families are in the zone of extreme danger. Commissions have come to us from Moscow and there have been representatives of the higher trade union organs. And for some reason they all assured us that it is possible to live on our sick land.

In essence only our trade union committee came to the defense of the people. We went to Moscow and visited the CPSU Central Committee and the Council of Ministers. We met with many workers and came to the conclusion that almost nobody needs us. We demanded that readings be taken on our land. It turned out that we had 24 population points that should have been evacuated as early as 1986. There are 884 families living in them, with 2,730 people including 206 children. But there was actually nowhere for them to move to—we were offered abandoned villages with half-burned huts.

And what about work! If this is a young family and the wife can be a milkmaid and the husband a machine operator, they will be accepted gladly in the remote areas. But nobody needs older people. And nobody needs us now. The medical and trade workers have left.

While in past years both the AUCCTU and our Belorussian Trade Union Council found passes to send us to sanatoriums and recreational facilities, this year the health problem is being handled extremely poorly here.

And when people sometimes raise the question of transferring social security to the hands of the soviets and the state this is out of complete lack of knowledge of life. I think the question should be raised differently—concerning the unification of the state system and the system of the centralized fund for social security of kolkhoz workers. There can be no parallel structures here.

[Borodin] What is happening in the trade unions under the conditions of perestroyka? Before answering this question one must figure out the situation in which the chemists find themselves. And they are in a critical situation. Equipment is becoming catastrophically outdated and 60-70 percent of it is worn out and obsolete. We wait for pharmaceutical preparations in the drug store and the equipment is so outdated that it cannot satisfy the needs of the population.

Working conditions and the ecology are deteriorating. On the one hand, everyone requires the goods of the chemist, and on the other, they say: We must close down chemistry, it hampers us, it is harmful to the health. The chemists' standard of living is declining sharply. They work 24 hours a day under harmful conditions and on night shifts. And 53 percent of them are women.

What can be done? What tactics should our trade union choose? Should they defend the interests of the workers? But this is a general phrase, and how do we realize it in practice? We need a concept of the trade union movement in the modern stage and its theoretical development. But, unfortunately, today we do not have such a thing.

The government is looking for a way out of the economic crisis and has taken the easiest path—to place all the weight on the shoulders of the workers. After all there is nowhere else to get funds. Here is one "innocent" decree: The government issued a command not to change the normatives of the five-year plan but at the same time a decree was adopted on 1 January to establish new wholesale prices and rates for diesel fuel, electric energy, and cargo shipments. The trade unions would not tolerate this and came into conflict with the government. How did it respond? A statement was issued: Comrades, calm down, we will compensate you. That let of the steam. But as far as compensation goes there has been none so far. And again telegrams are coming to us: The government has deceived us—there is not enough money for the implementation of social programs and housing construction, and there is no money for wages.

Or a couple of days ago on television we saw: It is necessary to gather the harvest in the south but the combines and tractors are left without fuel and lubricants. But we have already warned the government: As of 1 April 1990 1.5 million tons of mineral fertilizers and 4 million tons of petroleum products had accumulated in the storehouses. We cannot process the oil since all storage facilities are filled. And they cannot work in the south today because they do not have enough fuel and lubricants. Why? They could not bring out the transportation and organize its rhythmic operation.

Our trade union's central committee has suggested that the government hold a meeting between the chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and other members of the government and representatives of labor collectives. There has been no reaction. So we chemists are forced to support the miners and show our lack of confidence in the government since it does not want to hold a discussion with us. Therefore we have been forced to turn to the USSR president.

[Question-Rejoinder] But are you not acting like poor relatives: These do not give and those do not accept?...

[Borodin] That is not the point. I am saying that we intend to take our fate into our own hands. But we must have the funds, the money in our pocket. The domestic market cannot provide us with the necessary equipment. We cannot go to the foreign market because we do not have hard currency. We earn it but we only get to keep 20 percent of it. Therefore we have raised this issue: Let us provide for ourselves. Just create normal conditions for us. And then we will not have to meet these normative requirements which the state has set. We have no other way out.

But, on the other hand, we must change the structure of the trade unions. The trade unions are now based on the occupational principle. There is probably no need for the Federation of Independent Trade Unions to reach the level of the local party organizations. It should fill the orders of the branch trade unions in relations with the government, the Supreme Soviet, and so forth.

[Malakhatkina] I want to add to what Vasiliy Karpovich said. We must switch to principles of federalism, that is, voluntary entry into the federation. And we are certainly not saying that the Federation should reach down to the local levels. We are speaking about having the local units delegate their rights to the higher trade union organizations.

[Korzhov] We are discussing the idea of what a trade union should be more and more. But few people are thinking about this question: Why are the workers and the administration, who represent two sides of labor relations, included in one trade union?

[Borodin] Indeed the leader and the director also require trade union protection from the higher organ, just as the workers require protection from the leader...

[Yakunova] Such questions are not raised on our kolkhoz. Neither the board nor the party committee exerts pressure on the trade union, bosses it around, or gives it instructions. The shop committee has managed to get milk for workers in the boiler houses, to buy equipment for the recreation rooms, and to increase the workers' pay after their rates were adjusted. We are preparing new proposals in conjunction with the board for the protection of labor and social issues. The people

are drawn to the shop committee and are beginning to see the trade union as a protector. Yes, our society is changing. There is much that is new in the activity of the trade unions. But the main thing for us remains unchanged: Spend every day with those who elected you chairman of the shop committee. Know their troubles and problems. Help whenever you can. That is how I understand trade union work.

[Arapov] In past weeks millions of subscribers have not been receiving TRUD and in certain cities deliveries of PRAVDA are being interrupted. So the trade unions and the party have again ended up on the same side of the barricade in the struggle against the forces that do not like either the restored and renewed party or the trade unions that have gained their voice. In this situation it is extremely necessary for the trade unions to expand the framework of glasnost and have their own local periodicals. In some places they have begun to publish trade union weeklies but their development again is being hampered by the shortage of paper. Therefore all kinds of support should be given to the position of those party publications which (like PRIOKSKAYA PRAVDA in Ryazan) each week include on their pages a "newspaper within a newspaper"—a selection of materials on the subject of trade unions. The trade unions are preparing for their very important 19th congress and the party press must not stand on the sidelines of the discussion of the fate of the trade union movements in the country.

And when the trade unions are deprived of the opportunity to express their view, the working class does not like it. It needs militant trade unions. Regardless of which turn the economic reform may take in our country, regardless of the forms of ownership that may appear, still every morning millions of people will have to get up and go to work. And in the past two centuries mankind has come up with nothing other than trade unions to protect the interests of the workers. There will always be trade unions. And this means that to reinforce the trade unions and make them more militant, efficient, and responsive to the interests of the workers today is a task for all honest people who are living and working in our country.

[Frolov] I agree. The situation is changing now and probably not only in the CPSU. Other parties will also have their own mass media. Very difficult changes are now taking place in the society. And I think we all must show courage and firmness and not give in to moods of panic which, unfortunately, are very widespread in the society.

Of course, the new path is not strewn with roses, including the path to the trade unions. There will be mistakes and there will be obstacles. Our awareness is distorted by stereotypes. And not only ours but also that of the people who are making the decisions. We must get ready for a serious analysis and for hard work. We can blame our difficulties on whomever we like. But to interpret what is taking place, to find a way out of the crisis, and to take the responsibility on our own shoulders is more difficult than to engage in finger pointing. What good are loud slogans when what we need now is calm work. And so I think it is you, the trade union activists, the people who are closely associated with the workers and peasants and in general with all the workers—you are the ones who are really capable of directing the people toward this calm work.

Program Examines Future of Television

LD2207180890

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1600 GMT on 20 July carries a 60-minute program entitled: "Dialogue at Ostankino," subtitled "What Is Television To Be Like?"

The program begins with a five-minute sequence of interviews asking people in the street their feelings about television, their views of the programs put out, their preferences, whether Soviet television programs cover the right areas and are perceived as objective. The scene then moves into the studio where journalist Sergey Slipchenko is to chair a live discussion based on viewers' written and phoned-in questions. A telephone number is announced and in the backgrond telephone operators in booths can be seen waiting to take questions from viewers.

Slipchenko introduces the participants in the discussion, who are identified by name plates on their desks in the studio:

Genrikh Zigmundovich Yushkyavichyus, deputy chairman of USSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting [Gosteleradio];

Vsevolod Leonidovich Bogdanov, general director of the Main Program Directorate [Glavnaya Direktsiya Programm] of Central Television;

Valentin Ivanovich Khlebnikov, head of the Main Production and Technical Directorate [glavnoye proizvodstvenno-tekhnichestkoye upravleniye];

Valeriy Nikitich Gorokhov, director of the Television Technical Center.

Slipchenko points out that the discussion will concern technical matters rather than political. The program has been prepared in quite a hurry, in the wake of the Presidential Decree on democratization of television and radio.

Slipchenko goes on to refer to Gorbachev's visit yesterday to Gosteleradio and shows a three-minute clip of Gorbachev at the head of a long table addressing television luminaries who are seated along both sides. Next comes a clip of him visiting the Vremya studio, looking at equipment and sitting in the presenter's seat, then visiting the "Vremya" editorial office. This is followed by a clip of his live appearance on the Mayak "Panorama" program, including a short voice extract.

Back to the live program. Slipchenko quotes the reference in the Presidential Decree to the invalidity of any actions by local bodies to take over broadcasting facilities without reference to the USSR Council of Ministers. He says this has aroused "stormy reactions, including among members of supreme soviets of various republics," since Russia and Ukraine have both lately passed decisions on setting up, or democratizing, their own television services. So, he asks Yushkyavichyus, "can it be considered that, with the aid of this decree, Gosteleradio is trying to be, or to remain for the future, in a monopoly position as regards television broadcasting in the country?"

Yushkyavichyus' reply begins: "To be in a monopoly position Gosteleradio does not need this decree, because according to the existing order we are now in a monopoly position. And I see this decree as a bloc to the Gosteleradio monopoly in television and radio." He then points out that the decree specifically talks of making broadcasting facilities and time available to local broadcasting committees and of these functioning independently of political organizations. He goes on: "I consider that this decree marks the beginning of civilized television and radio broadcasting in our country, that our television and radio will finally come to operate the same way they operate in the majority of countries of the world, in accordance with a law on television and radio." He elaborates the idea of such a law, which does not yet exist in the USSR but is needed. Even in countries where television operates on a highly competitive basis, for instance in the United States, there is always a juridical framework providing a form of state coordination. "I would say that there is a dialectical aspect to this decree. On the one hand it requires that television and radio should be retained as a structure of the whole nation; yet on the other it offers freedom to, say, local bodies, and I would say to other organizations too. For, whether we like it or not, many organizations have already appeared which are making programs—APN has started making marvellous programs; I know that TASS is preparing to; a whole series of cable networks is coming into being, together with program-making cooperatives. But up to now none of these are able to get on the air. This decree now provides the opportunity to move to a state of affairs permitting this."

Bogdanov comes in to suggest that the monopoly should be that of the viewers and that viewers' wishes to have more control over what is shown came through very clearly in the opening street interviews. Yuzhkyavichyus adds that a law on broadcasting could clarify this and could codify the matter of access by political groups—he quotes provision in France and Germany in this respect.

Slipchenko reads three questions sent in from viewers in Moscow, Leningrad and Minsk asking when Russia's own television service will come into being and others asking when there will be channels dedicated to special interests, sport for instance. "Why," Slipchenko adds, "have I put this group of questions together? Because deputies in the Russian Supreme Soviet are currently posing the question in the following way: Central Television is obliged to share its airtime, its equipment and its channels with Russia. Russia has invested a great deal in creating Central Television and Gosteleradio. It is therefore assumed that there will be a channel for Russia. Whether this is possible and will come about is the question our viewers are asking."

Yushkyavichyus replies: "Well, let us begin with the question of Russian television. There are at least three comrades sitting here who as far back as eight years ago were saying that Russia ought to have its own television service. At that time we were told that this was a technocrats' idea which was not politically valid. Now at last, thank God, it is realized that Russia should indeed have its own television service. But television is not something you can bring about overnight. There have to be funds. And there have to be certain structures in place—relay lines, satellite communications and so on, such as those used to carry the nationwide programming. And there are great difficulties that arise here. If now we were to want—as is being proposed currently, for instance by the Russian Federation Ministry of Communications—to broadcast a channel for Russia this could be done. But one needs to bear in mind that there may be many people living in other republics who would be deprived of the Second All-Union program." He asks Khlebnikov to supply some relevant figures.

Khlebnikov notes that 72 percent of the country's population can currently watch Central Television's Second Program and this would mean some 60 million Russian speakers in the Union republics losing this program. In the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] at present there are two channels available: the first carrying Central Television First Program and the second carrying Central Television Second Program together with local programming—there are 70 local television centers in the RSFSR each putting out between one and three hours of programs daily via a network of roughly 3,500 transmitters. So the question of when a Russian channel could be created has two answers. If one means an entirely separate channel then the answer is "years" because of the need to create a further network of facilities, though this will undoubtedly come in due course. Yet the RSFSR Supreme Soviet resolution calls for a preliminary definition of such a program by 15 September—almost at once. At the same time, the Presidential Decree says airtime must be allotted for operating channels so this would mean finding airtime on Central Television Second Program for Russian television programs. This could be done but it would have to be accommodated within the technical facilities at Ostankino which are currently used for Central Television's two channels.

Slipchenko says he wants to show two video reports about new developments at Latvian and Ukrainian television. A video report shows external views of Latvian television headquarters and mast, then clips of studios, control rooms and foyers. The correspondent's voice-over mentions that the mast is 368 meters high, weighs

700 tonnes and contains two lifts. The new center cost over 40 million rubles [R]. The 20-story building includes five television studios, as well as the full range of other offices and facilities. Television now reaches the most far-flung parts of the republic and many Latvians now watch Leningrad television as well as their own and the two channels of Central Television. The correspondent then interviews an unidentified official who complains that they have to try to work with five different video recording formats and that their life is further complicated by the lack of certain types of equipment.

A video report then shows construction work in progress on new headquarters for Ukrainian television, which is being built alongside the 20-year-old television mast not far from the center of Kiev. The main block will be 22 storys high, including eight studios, of which two will be of 600 square meters. Work began in 1983 and this year technical installation is due to start, with the first phase due to start broadcasting programs in 1991. The correspondent interviews (Viktor Petrovich Arkusha), deputy chairman of Ukrainian Gosteleradio, who says the project was costed at R23 million, though the final cost may be higher because of rising prices; of that R19 million has so far been used.

Slipchenko comments on the cost of creating these two new television centers and wonders what would be the cost of creating one for Russia, with associated network facilities. Yushkyavichyus reckons the cost to be at least R100 million for a television and radio headquarters, and Khlebnikov thinks the network transmission facilities would cost around R800 million which would provide a service for 70 percent of the republic's population. Slipchenko adds that Russian expenditure for 1990 is budgetted at R138,075,971,000—this figure was confirmed to him by the Gosteleradio information office. Yushkyavichyus says that if set against the figure of approximately R1 billion quoted above for setting up a new service the latter—amounting to less than one percent of national income—is well in line with world averages of seven or eight percent of national income spent on development of communications.

Yushkyavichyus goes on to say: "A part of the All-Union Second Program must certainly be offered to Russia—there can be no doubt on that score. As for radio broadcasting, we have specific proposals to hive off a whole network of independent radio stations which could carry the Russian program, even with time shifts. And of course Russia must have its own television service. There can be no doubt about that. The fact is that we have a problem, and this problem must not be solved by simply making do with the existing facilities. I shall never forget how, prior to the Olympic Games, they were trying to tell us that there was no need to construct any new facilities, that we could perfectly well broadcast the Olympics from the Shabolovka studios. Even intelligent people like Kosygin were telling us: 'We have the biggest television center in Europe, the biggest television mast. So what else can you need? If we build a new television center it will just lie empty'. The fact is that today we still do not have enough space. If we had not gone ahead and built the new facilities 10 years ago, then today Siberia and the Far East would have no means of watching Central Television programs or listening to the radio at times that suit the people. The time has now come to take a further step. So we have to tackle the question of how to organize such broadcasts. Clearly it is difficult to do it as a full program, unless some other programming is to be removed to make way for it. But more building is absolutely essential."

Yushkyavichyus highlights the particular plight of children's television and Gorokhov confirms that it is sorely short of resources. Bogdanov adds that they would like to show more films but this is becoming expensive, and viewers are clamoring for more entertainment and relaxation programs, but in addition to the problem of costs "we have so much politicized television, so many discussion programs, and it is very difficult to do something for the soul, for the human being." Slipchenko then adds: "Discussion programs like this one of ours today," and Bogdanov concurs.

Slipchenko comments that it might be difficult to understand this alleged pressure on space, since if one walks around the television center one finds many studios apparently not in use. Is it not perhaps possible to organize more rational use of facilities? Gorokhov says there is some scope but programs take time to make and this accounts for the apparent underuse of space. Slipchenko refers to his notes and questions and asks whether foreign experience has anything to teach in this area. Yuzhkyavichyus quotes figures from British television on use of studio time. A discussion ensures people's perceptions of what is money well spent, which leads to Yushkyavichuus to say the following: "Last year all of us to a man were up in arms when they tried to chop R300 million from us. Our budget is R2.7 billion. That might seem a lot, but if you divide that by the number of inhabitants and work how much is being spent per head it turns out to be not such a lot. So, in comparison with other television and radio organizations we really are badly off. And what is particularly galling is that we should be poor even now. Because for many years industry—and it was the military industries which served us—was not very willing to accommodate our needs, because there was a lot of confusion about the equipment we needed—for it is complex equipment, indeed even more complex than that used by the armed forces. So there was a lot of trouble and argument, not much honor, not much in the way of material commitment or morale. And now, when they are able to come to us offering us the latest things they have developed and such possibilities do now exist, we simply do not have the funds." Slipchenko adds: "And I should add that of those R2.7 billion which Gosteleradio has at its disposal, it gives R2 billion to the Ministry of Communications for the rent of satellite channels and cable networks. That is 75 percent, so there is not such a lot left."

Slipchenko then says he has a large number of questions asking when cable television is coming, then goes on:

"There is even a question—which I think I passed to you—from West Germany, asking: When will it be possible to see Moscow Television in West Germany?" Yushkyavichyus correct him: "No, it refers to the Second Program. Because the All-Union Television First Program can be received via our satellites practically everywhere in the world, with the exception of the west coast of the United States of America. And we know," he adds with a smile and a chuckle, "that sometimes people even watch it without our permission."

Slipchenko refers to a number of questions which all come down to the question of channels and communications links, and asks for an explanation of this aspect of broadcasting. Khlebnikov says he will try to explain this rather complex area. After some general explanation mentioning that the country has a frequency schedule allowing at least three television programs to be broadcast throughout the country, while in some places it may go to six, and comparing this situation with that in some other countries, he says: "A television broadcasting system using satellites operating in a new frequency band is currently being worked on. This will allow two more central programs, one program for each Union republic and a number of regional programs to be on the air by 1995. But once again the problem arises of a shortage of frequencies, so here we have to combine satellite possibilities and those offered by cable networks."

Slipchenko interrupts: "Could I just come in with a question dealing with this area of frequencies and satellites. It is no longer a secret that practically all our country's satellites were manufactured to Defense Ministry orders and put into orbit using Defense Ministry means, even though these satellites are used for exclusively civilian purposes. Now that conversion is in progress and certain transformations are taking place in the structure of the armed forces, then some frequencies and satellites, some channels, should become free. I am thinking of the chart I have seen showing the usage made of the Gorizont-series satellites. Over certain parts of the territory of our country the load on Gorizont satellites amounts to five, 15 or 25 percent. This seems to be expensive equipment which is simply idle. Can we not make use of these frequencies and channels?"

Khlebnikov replies: "Thank you for an interesting question. Those satellites you are talking about—the Gorizont—form the most widespread of our communications satellite systems. It is true that the system's load is low but not where its television channels are concerned. They are very well loaded, and the only one not occupied was in the new so-called 12 gigahertz band, and as it happens we have just today completed discussions in Novosibirsk to make use of that channel, and create a regional program for the area of Siberia stretching from Tyumen to Baykal. So there are small reserves, but in order to provide quickly for a Russian channel, for instance, we would have to—and we are already envisaging this in our decisions—launch a further three Gorizont satellites. Beyond that—and you have rightly spoken about conversion, as you know well, we have been talking about this and there has been much written in the press—there is the question of using the Energiya system. This would be quite an expensive project, but we have certain hopes." To a question from one of the other panellists he adds: "We have said that we would want 160 television channels on this Energiya satellite, and they told us that is no problem." After some repartee among the speakers Yuzhkyavichyus adds: "But there is another problem. You said quite rightly that the satellites were launched by the defense sector, but when cuts started to come along in defense financing, unfortunately those cuts began to have an effect on our affairs, where satellites were concerned."

After a comment by Bogdanov, Yuzhkyavichyus continues: "I should like to remind you that the country has 124 television program centers, and there are studios in many towns. But unfortunately, because of the shortage of channels—though maybe not only for that reason, and perhaps we are to blame too—local programming is very rarely seen on Central Television. I would go as far as to say that of late such programming has become even rarer than before." Bogdanov takes up the point: "We are now being swamped with letters from viewers saying they have forgotten what their local television presenters look like and this is because you are constantly putting out on the Second Program—where the local programming is supposed to fit—programs of a kind which cannot be cut into—either supreme soviet sessions or a congress, or now there has been a decision that as many films, as possible have to be screened. And when a film is screened this is a tragedy for the head of the local television and radio committee because, as he will say, 'I can't put my programme on. My viewers want to see the film.'"

Slipchenko reads a question concerning the recent cutting-back by Lithuania of Central Television Second Program, and Yuzhkyavichyus recapitulates the terms of the arrangement arrived at under which the central Gosteleradio authorities will finance the retransmission. The discussion then moves on to the problems of people in one area wanting to see local programs from other areas, in particular to rivalry between Moscow and Leningrad in this context.

Yushkyavichyus says: "You know, I shall probably get beaten up when I leave this studio for saying what I am about to say, but I shall repeat what I wrote in IZVESTIYA. That is what we have to get back to subscription payment. There is no other way. There has to be logic in this. The theater is now working under financial autonomy, sports facilities likewise, Goskino [State Committee Cinematography] no longer hands out films free of charge—they have to be paid for. There will have to be concessions for the less well-off, of invalids and pensioners and so on, but unless there is subscription payment we shall not get by. Everywhere in the world there is either advertising or subscription payment or both. But as far as advertising goes, to make a living from advertising there has to be a competitive consumer goods sector. We do not as yet have such compeition,

and what we derive from advertising clearly comes nowhere near meeting our needs."

Khlebnikov says he wants to return to the question of satellites and channels, to answer a question from West Germany asking if Central Television Second Program can be received there. He explains that it is available on Statsionar-11 at 11 degrees west and that a dish of five to seven meters is needed.

Yushkyavichyus reads a question about the possibility of cable networks in the RSFSR, referring to a congress of cable operators to be held in Moscow on 1-5 August. He says Gosteleradio is very positively inclined toward cable television and that is may be able to help in providing programs, so as to get away from the infringements of copyright often involved in cable operations and thereby facilitate a more civilized form of television. There will also be a need to standardize equipment so that industry will be able to provide suitable hardware.

Slipchenko reads some more questions about the need for a Russian television service and Yuzhkyavichuy recapitulates some of his earlier points.

Slipchenko reads some more questions about the need for a Russian television service in Yuzhkyavichuy recapitulates some of his earlier points.

Slipchenko rounds off the broadcast by offering a video report which he describes as a "cri de coeur" from a man who has worked all his life in television but never before appeared before the cameras. This unidentified engineer or technician is seen in the television center main control room standing before a bank of monitors. All this equipment, he says, was the latest thing when it was installed for the Olympic games but is now well behind the times. He continues hesitantly in this vein when the broadcast is cut as there is only 30 seconds left to the start of the "Vremya" program.

Nature of Election Process Questioned

PM2407130790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Jul 90 Morning Edition p 1

[Article by Eduard Gonzelyez under the "Political Diary" rubric: "We Vote, They Choose Us"]

[Text] How often this fails to coincide with the interests of the cause and the voters. On Friday, an AUCCTU [All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions] Plenum released G. Yanayev of the greater part of his duties as AUCCTU chairman. Gennadiy Ivanovich has probably succeeded in fulfilling the lesser part in the three months he has held the post.

The matter was decided in 30 seconds. Although I recall that in April they were serious and took a long time electing him. At the time Yanayev had rivals but only before he first mounted the rostrum—when he was in front of the microphone all admitted as one man that there was no alternative to Gennadiy Ivanovich. Now, whether they want it or not, an alternative must be found.

"What can you do?" one AUCCTU leader said. "People grow."

And with agonizing rapidity—as though there had been some kind of acceleration. Five minutes after his April election G. Yanayev delivered a one-hour report in which he outlined the trade unions' position as opposition to the government. A month later he warmly supported the government's concept at the Supreme Soviet session. And he proved more pious than many other deputies—the concept was nonetheless sent for reworking. Then at a press conference the AUCCTU chairman explained he had been misunderstood. And G. Yanayev was elected a member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

The events cited here have been described in the press, including in our newspaper. I have merely systematized them and have been persuaded yet again that miracles do not happen—people do not grow that quickly. Rather it is simply that the crown has been cut off and the lower branches have become the top ones. And it is from them that the AUCCTU chairman will have to be elected.

But not today. The AUCCTU plenum decided to wait three months until the congress of trade unions and for the time being to elect one more deputy chairman—the main one, so to speak, for this period. The presidium suggested two candidates—AUCCTU Secretary V. Mishin and V. Shcherbakov, chairman of the Moscow City Trade Unions Council. An attempt from the auditorium to add to the list naturally came up against a refusal.

The first candidate said that he did not intend to come out with a detailed program. He limited himself to general (in my view too general) ideas: "The trade unions can and must be the guarantors of social and public stability in the country." No one asked what that meant and there were almost no questions at all.

A. Shcherbakov was asked: "What have you done specifically as chairman of the Moscow City Trade Unions Council?"

"My first two years in the trade unions were hard," he replied. "Work seemed to be proceeding but there was no return. But now things seem to have gotten moving..."

The auditorium accepted this explanation. How have we grown accustomed to judging candidates by virtually only two signs, and not the most important: their last job and their last public statement? Now, it is true, high office gives approximately equal grounds for seeking an elected office and... a personal pension. That is already progress—before first the former and then the latter were the person's due. Unfortunately, almost no account is taken of what a person has done. The party leaders' reports at the recent congress were highly indicative in

that respect. Well, how doubts that any Politburo member works 12-14 hours a day? But when the time came to report, how difficult it was for some of them to submit anything material.

But it turned out that even that was not compulsory. Let us recall that the most tumultuous ovation was bestowed on the leader who could demonstrate nothing but principles—the state of agriculture did not allow it. Reports on successful activity in another field, the international field, did not generate such delight. Positions, relations, moods, and words are for us still far more important than deeds.

Although we only had to alter the criteria slightly, take as our basis not a list of posts held but achievements and programs but achievements and programs for the Leningrad city soviet, the Moscow city soviet, and the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet to appear...

The speakers at the AUCCTU plenum admitted that the candidacies on offer were "approximately equal." And one speaker stated frankly that there was actually no one to choose from. "Is there really no one among us who thinks in an innovatory manner?" he asked angrily. This was the upper limit of the voters' interest in the results of the elections.

Why did no one come out and suggest a competitive candidacy. After all, they knew why they were meeting. The presidium had prepared very well for the elections. And the auditorium? Is that not why we as voters most often merely confirm by voting or reject someone's choice? "The presidium recommends... The conference of representatives recommends... The secretariat has studied the candidates..." That means someone has already assumed the greater part of responsibility for the consequences. So why spend a long time thinking about it now?

And now we can see the congresses of people's deputies and note with belated regret that far from all the elected representatives are in keeping with their role. We hear Supreme Soviet members and we realize that rotation would indeed be no bad thing. Almost all the press has refused to support the conservatively minded delegates of the Russian Communist Party Constituent Congress and treated their election dubiously.

But, forgive me for the reproach, that was to a considerable extent our choice! We elected that constituent congress and all other congresses.

You say that the elections were such that you could not elect anyone else? For instance, the notorious quota from the public organizations. But allow me to remind you how Moscow's scientific public dealt with it. They went to the Academy of Sciences carrying placards and achieved the election of the man they wanted. But later, who is preventing an election struggle beginning with the terms of the election? Why can the rules of the game be imposed by people interested in the results while we only place "stakes?"

People may remark that the election of the AUCCTU deputy chairman is not the occasion to embark on profound "philosophizing" on the subject of elections in general. And other—more global—elections are not foreseen.

Only why are they not foreseen? Soon there will be the elections to the USSR Supreme Soviet and the local soviets. Yes, yes, very soon. That is there is no time to lose if we do not want to miss the opportunity once again. After all there are a very great many of us voters, it is harder for us to agree than for any presidium.

And as for the elections which served as the pretext for this talk, Vladimir Pavlovich Shcherbakov was elected AUCCTU deputy chairman by secret ballot. I congratulate him and all trade union members.

Court's Power Over Press Freedom Pondered

90US1140A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
10 Jul 90 Morning Edition p 3

[Article by IZVESTIYA special correspondent I. Dementyeva: "The Cunning Letter: Reflections on Honor and Dignity in the Hallway of the Moscow Oblast Court"]

[Text] No sooner had the new law "On the Status of Judges in the USSR" taken effect than it turned out that I had violated it.

I attended a trial in Volokolamsk and published in IZVESTIYA (No. 36) the report entitled "A Lost Case."

In its official letter the Department of Justice of the Moscow Oblispolkom [Oblast Executive Committee] communicated: "As of the time of publication the ruling of the Volokolamsk People's Court on the lawsuit brought by A. Pugach against V. Samodurov had not become legally valid."

I apologize. A court ruling is considered to become legally valid not after it is announced in the courtroom, as many people think, but only after the second, appellate court lets it stand, having reviewed complaints and protests on this ruling.

The Volokolamsk ruling became legally valid three and a half months after its consideration by the people's court, whereas the article "A Lost Case" was published as soon as one month later. That is to say, as the Justice Department of the Moscow Oblispolkom indicated, "the author allowed a violation of Article 5, Point 3 of the law to occur."

This is the case. All of it is correct.

At the same time, all of it is wrong. Had it been possible to publish the report "A Lost Case" as many as three and a half months after the event, we could have blocked it ahead of time. The timing is important in this instance

for more than its own sake. In the court, a newspaperman is interested not in the trial itself but in what comes into focus in the trial—in this case, a sharp civic conflict in a little rayon center city on the eve of the first democratic elections to local soviets. It does not make sense to discuss it later. The long-awaited Law on the Press was not yet adopted, but the one on restricting the press already applied.

The arguments are as noble and democratic as can be: "Do you remember how the press raved in 1937? After all, you don't want a repeat of that, do you?" We do not! However, we do not want to be gagged because of yesterday's fears either. Meanwhile, what are they scaring IZVESTIYA with, what are they showing us? Yes, exactly this... Point 3 of Article 5 of the new law. The article is "Inadmissibility of interference in the consideration of court cases," the point is "The mass media do not have a right to predetermine in their reports the results of court proceedings involving specific cases before..."

It would be all right if it were before the sentence, before a ruling of the court of original jurisdiction (as I understood it, the draft law referred only to pretrial publications). This was not to be; the journalists were ordered to be "temporarily" silent—if not until the day of final judgment then until the day of appeal, which may turn out to be one and the same in terms of time.

Where does this leave the readers, whose right to timely and truthful information we now unanimously acknowledge, while actually offering him yesterday's news?

And what are we to tell those who come to the newspaper as their last resort? The ethical ban on journalists interfering in court cases until the sentence becomes legally valid slowed the press down before. I remember that the innocent Aleksey G., who was sentenced by the Sverdlovskiy People's Court of Moscow to eight years of maximum-security confinement, paid for it with one and a half years of prison confinement and correctional facility until the procurator's office sorted out the case through supervisory procedures. As a result of them the young man was fully rehabilitated. Was it really necessary to wait?

I am in favor of interference being impermissible. Nobody has a right to predetermine, that is, decide for the court, prior to trial, or to influence the court in another manner—on the phone, in private, in the office, or through intermediaries. However, no matter how fatal the interference by others, it does not leave traces, whereas in the case of the press the traces are clearly there—an article in the newspaper. For your article, we have our article—Article 5!

In addition to this (pay attention!) there is the criminal Article 1 of the still newer law "On Responsibility for Contempt of Court" which makes influencing the court "in any form whatsoever" worth corrective-labor work or a large fine. If exerting such influence was combined with abusing one's official position (and a journalist always uses a newspaper) he stands a real chance of losing his freedom for a period of up to three years unless he manages to somehow prove that he had no aim whatsoever to "cause an unlawful court ruling." Penance is in order, as well as an oath not to come any closer than one kilometer to the court.

So, the law has been adopted and applies. In keeping with the letter of the law, the entire press, television, and radio should be silent about trials and investigations. Examples are to be given only from history textbooks.

Meanwhile, they are not silent!

After all, newspapers publish current courtroom news in almost every issue without hindrance, reporting on sentences of racketeers, hijackers of planes, car thieves, murderers, and bribe-takers. But if the new norm is to be complied with, all these rulings now handed down have not yet become legally valid and may be canceled or amended in the future, and ultimately the criminal may turn out not to be a criminal! How are we to treat the "anticipatory" communiques of the state security and procuracy?

After all, we are not supposed to think that laws are written to be used selectively, permitting them in some cases to turn a blind eye to violations while catching newspapermen red-handed in others, are we?

Why not, we are supposed to. This is exactly what we are supposed to think. They say that the law provides for penalties for only those publications that predetermine court decisions; mere reporting is all right!

In this case, would you please explain to me what foreordain and predetermine mean? Incidentally, "mere information" is nonjudgmental only at a very superficial glance. Besides, if there is a will, it can be abused: With a build-up of reports, such prior hullabaloo may be created as not even the most detailed court essay can create! Here is a recent example—this is how a special atmosphere was created around B. Yeltsin through the use of "innocent" reports and interviews, and so on.

I am afraid that some people are not happy with other newspaper materials in which a journalist allows himself to have his own concept of the case which differs from that of the court. It would not do to praise the virtues of our guild, which is not without sin, but giving up one's dignity is worse than sin. This is why I will recall that in the godforsaken times of stagnation it was exactly the sharp court essay that became the genre which even then scored some small and great victories—from individual biographies straightened out to revealing the grave flaws of investigative and court practices—a genre which foreordained and predetermined (whichever you prefer) the noisy, law-affirming actions of perestroyka. So, is the genre to come to an end at a time of glasnost?

What is the orientation of the press going to be? It turns out that a journalist arguing for and advertising a sentence, even one that is repealed in the future, is absolutely, safe whereas as soon as he starts doubting, thinking, stating his doubts publicly, or raising an alarm, he is threatened with total discomfort. Is this so?

Likewise, in its official letter to the editorial office the Moscow Oblispolkom Department of Justice objects to the very "spirit" of the publication "A Lost Case" rather than defends the letter of the law.

It contrasts its utterly favorable assessment of the court procedure in Volokolamsk with my "unfavorable" one:

"The case was heard in an open court session with the parties present... the court interrogated three witnesses for the plaintiff and three for the defendant..."

I also had one free observation in the article which goes exactly to the point of the "equality of the parties." Since there is no coat stand in the court building the defendant, Chairman of the Volokolamsk Gorispolkom [City Executive Committee] V. Samodurov and his chief witness, Secretary of the Gorkom [city party committee] V. Fedorova, left their coats in the office of the presiding judge who is also chairperson of the Volokolamsk Court, N. Levashova, whereas "the team" of the plaintiff, physician of the Central Rayon Hospital A. Pugach, left their jackets on the benches right in the courtroom.

The Department of Justice "agrees" with me in earnest: "The publication is correct to raise the issue of the poor material and technical facilities of the court, which has no special rooms for witnesses or cloakroom for visitors."

Could it be that they really failed to understand? Well, I will explain: The issue was not the absence of the cloakroom in the court building but the absence of scruples in the behavior of these three members of the administrative elite of the city (all of these three are members of the gorkom, and members of the executive committee), and indifference with regard to what people are going to say. Let us recall what became the cause of the trial: Responding to criticism by Dr. Pugach of a delayed hospital construction project at a city rally, Mayor of the city V. Samodurov declared to the citizens that he personally was not going to give up a special polyclinic and would not get treatment at the Central Rayon Hospital...as long as Pugach works there as a physician. However, those citizens who, unlike Samodurov, have no access to a special hospital still have to seek treatment from Pugach, and he, the only physician of the highest category in the rayon, has to defend his medical reputation in the court.

Respected employees of the Justice Department, I have not predetermined anything. Indeed, the Collegium of the Moscow Oblast Court for civil cases did strike down the ruling of the Volokolamsk City Court and sent the case for reconsideration not to Volokolamskiy Rayon but to the neighboring Istrinskiy Rayon, which is hard to disagree with.

Frankly, I was happy with something else too—the principled approach of judges. They had no regard for "the percent of confirmation" of lower court decisions, they acted contrary to the offensive popular nickname "the oblast rubber stamp..."

However, this was not to be! After the letter from the Department of Justice, the editorial office received a message from the procuracy of Moscow Oblast: Chairman of the Moscow Oblast Court M.M. Bobrov appealed the determination of his own collegium, and the presidium of the oblast court acceded to this protest. The case was referred for consideration to a new composition of another collegium.

So, once again A. Pugach and I sit in the hallway of the Moscow Oblast Court—Pugach in his continuous attempt to defend his professional dignity, and I who have written an article in his support in an attempt to defend mine. We wait for a call to the courtroom.

However, there is time to think through to the end what my pressure on the court is about and how I can harm the court with my criticism (provided, of course, they I do not twist the facts)...

If I were an experienced judge I would really take offense: How can the law even assume that a mature jurist, having read an article in the newspaper, would want to act not only against his inner conviction but even contrary to the law?

Still, I believe that a judge cannot be a man of the crowd. Even given that the standard of our judges as a group leaves a lot to be desired, I dare not think something like that about all of them individually, to say nothing of highly skilled members of the oblast and kray courts where, as a rule, specialists go who have already been through a serious rayon-level school.

If I am wrong, and our corps of judges is indeed that unstable and susceptible to influence as they believe in the organs of justice, critical attention to the activities of the corps is all the more necessary. I will not conceal the fact that I have happened to attend trials which were conducted in a manner so outrageous that even many years of journalistic training did not necessarily restrain me from an immediate reaction...

However, I am rebuked for contradicting myself. It was your newspaper that wrote about new methods of influencing the court which were brought to life by democracy, about "a loudspeaker law," and about a case where an entire village is on strike seeking a stiffer sentence for a murderer; how would you like a demonstration in front of a people's court? I don't like it: As a rule, the atmosphere of rallies prompts the speakers to entirely forget about the presumption of innocence. They say

that there are complaints about people's deputies themselves: Previously, a rayon committee secretary could demand that the file of a case not yet heard be placed on his desk, and the elected representatives of the people happen to do this. It is bad! Still, it can be resolved, resolved with the help of glasnost, the skill of talking to the people, and, if necessary, opposing the elements rather than playing up to them. The rampage of emotions in front of the courthouses begins, as a rule, due to rumors, mistrust, and unconvincing or insufficient information.

At any rate, a journalist states his arguments openly. Before the sentence, for as long as a judge has not formed his own opinion, he may still be confused if you breath "down his neck." However, what about later, when the result of all work by the investigation and the court has been arrived at and publicly announced? From this moment on, who can be harmed by any criticism, any attempt to once again sift a sentence through the sieve of doubts? What is there in this that is not useful to the three pillars of justice—complete, comprehensive, and objective consideration? The price of a mistake is too high!

I believe that there were and are things which the judges should be afraid of much more than the press. All of us forget that our much-praised influence was ensured for us by the apparatus, whereas the only lawful power of the press is the power of public opinion. Once it is really formed in our country, no grounds at all will be left for the artificial confrontation which is humiliating for both judges and journalists.

Therefore, our respected legislature, is it worthwhile to defend judges against journalists so zealously? Is it not a diversionary maneuver?

At any rate, the quantity of new laws should not predetermine their dubious quality. The norm has been in effect for half a year, running ahead of practice, but neither the legislature nor the Supreme Court have yet taken care of an interpretation with some degree of precision, which is what judges, readers, and legislators need.

The people's judges definitely need to be protected. Their role in our state and our society will continue growing with every passing year. Very little has been done to date for them, for their real independence and inviolability; more has been said than done. Raising salaries alone will not do it for as long as the everyday life and fate of judges still depend on local authorities, for example, on whether the oblast Department of Justice would place them on a reelection list, having coordinated this with the proper people.

At this point I begin to suspect that in our "perestroyka times" the new law has not been invented to protect judges. It protects the system rather than the judges, a system under which judges and journalists are assigned their proper places and under which it was so convenient and customary to live and to exercise influence or, as they frequently put it now, to use the entitlements of authority. Are those entitlements?

The courts and the press equally need independence not for their own sake but in order to—indeed, in order to exert influence, an invigorating influence, on the life of society! So far, we have not been particularly successful in this field. In this duel between a representative of the local authorities and a physician, the latter has so far been losing...

We were scheduled for 1100; meanwhile, it was getting close to dinner time.

A hostage to his honor, Pugach was keeping his spirits up, but he was getting less and less upbeat. Patients were waiting for him, including those with grave diseases. The situation was becoming hopeless: The more you stand up for honor and dignity the less of them you seem to have, regardless of what the court has to say.

However, what is in it for us after all, in this sense of dignity? As a poet wrote, "you cannot eat it, drink it, or kiss it." Meanwhile, at the Institute of State and Law I was told that Article 7 of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Civil Code ("Protection of Honor and Dignity") is going through a real "boom" at present: Previously such cases were rare, and now they come one after another.

One in six lawsuits concerning honor and dignity is brought against the press. The press is not at all infallible and should be accountable under the law on an equal footing if we ourselves do not want to hold on to a monopoly in the sphere of truth. All of it is correct, as long as it is on an equal footing, as long as all of these just sanctions defending man from, among others, the press do not remain directed exclusively against the press...

The state needs the dignity of citizens no less than the citizens themselves. Are our courts prepared to be in line with new expectations?

Is the law prepared to defend this most human of our human rights—the right to dignity?

It was getting close to 2000. The hallway was as empty as a railway terminal from which all trains have left together. Two elderly women with buckets and rags in their hands arrived. Having nodded toward the door behind which our collegium was working overtime, one woman said to the other: "Still, civil cases are much more difficult than criminal cases..."

Is this true!

However, ours was a case as simple as two times two. I am at a loss: How could it happen that it turned out to be five?

It turned out that it was simple.

There have been complaints about physician Pugach.

This is what the defendant said. It was unknown how many there were, and what kind they were. However, his subordinates reported to him that there have been complaints.

The court determined that there have beer complaints.

The first collegium had doubts: Were they serious, were they sound?

The second collegium objected: Why? After all, the defendant did not say whether they were serious or sound. He only said that there have been complaints. Therefore, information circulated by the defendant is true, though it does infringe on the dignity of the plaintiff.

The suit was thrown out.

There is always something spell-binding in the iron-clad logic of accomplished lawyers. You have to make an effort in order to come back to common sense.

Indeed—big deal, complaints. Is there a person who has not drawn some, especially if he is a rayon physician (this is a dynamic job). It is surprising that they only managed to scrape up five complaints in several years. And he took the issue to court just like that...

Was this really about complaints? Was it the complaints that he resented? Were they the subject of his lawsuit?

The residents present at the rally in question understood the mayor unambiguously: You cannot turn to Pugach for medical help; this is how bad a doctor he is. Since the residents have come to have a different opinion, the court could have easily established the lack of correspondence between this proclaimed reputation of Pugach and his real reputation by hearing witnesses, requesting from the hospital more than just compromising information, and querying the oblast curators from the Moscow Oblast Scientific Research Clinical Institute about the opinion they have of the therapeutic service of Volokolamskiy Rayon and its chief. I for one have done so. I was reassured when I heard that Volokolamsk is a satisfactory locality compared to others, that over there therapeutic aid is in the hands of a qualified person who, on top of this, is creative: His extensive medical practice does not prevent him from contributing serious articles to special scientific publications.

Apparently feeling that his position was shaky and inadequate, the defendant Samodurov made a number of other complaints about Pugach, in particular, "an unfavorable attitude toward party and soviet organs."

As a result of the three-staged proceedings, Pugach felt that his dignity suffered much more than before the trial.

What about Samodurov? What has he learned? This is important.

It looks like he has also been through a lot. He, an economic functionary in the past and subsequently a party functionary, second secretary of the city committee, had hardly faced such situations before.

He told me in a fit of temper in the hallway: "I have my dignity too."

It would be nice if he also made for himself the discovery that others have dignity too. It is necessary for a professional leading functionary, which he considers himself to be, to grasp this.

In the article I wrote that having failed to apologize to the doctor, he lost politically. Suffice it to mention that the citizens of Volokolamsk did not elect him to the oblast soviet.

Had Samodurov apologized he would have benefited, and so would other similar individuals. He would have gained authority. However, he has his own notion of prestige.

Indeed, one may think unwittingly that we have the ancient "class feeling" at work here which exists, whatever we call it—corporate morality or group egoism—and has not grown any weaker. What he, Samodurov, is "socially entitled to" at present (the expression of Samodurov himself used during court proceedings), will be socially protected.

At present, when honor and dignity are the talk of town, when everybody starting with the president demands that the state defend his dignity, including people's deputies, the militia, servicemen, and Samodurov, I catch myself having this heretical thought: Are we not witnessing the emergence of a new privilege to which some are "socially entitled" whereas others are not?

By the time this article was prepared for publication, an official message came from the RSFSR Supreme Court: The civil case involving a suit by A. Pugach against V. Samodurov has been verified through supervisory proceedings. Deputy Chairperson of the RSFSR Supreme Court N.Yu. Sergeyeva lodged a protest against the resolution of the Presidium of the Moscow Oblast Court and the ruling of the civil cases collegium dated 18 April 1990.

The ruling of the first collegium of the oblast court dated 22 February 1990 stands, and the case is referred for reconsideration to the Istra City People's Court.

A problem developed right away: By publishing the article on the cunning letter of the law, we once again violate this law and influence the forthcoming trial in a yet more dangerous manner, that is, before it hands down any ruling at all!

How long do we have to wait? It is impossible to predict. After all, the case is making a second round...

Perhaps the very contradictory nature and absurdity of the situation—and other press organs will definitely face it—may prompt the legislature to make the necessary amendments in the norms already adopted.

Otherwise, the legislature may just as well pass a law on barring correspondents from the courtrooms and making court reporting in the newspapers impermissible.

'Avalanche' of Jewish Emigration Viewed

90UN2358A Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 28, 14-20 Jul 90 pp 4-5

[Interview with V. Nosenko, candidate of historical sciences, by ARGUMENTY I FAKTY correspondent D. Makarov; place and date not given: "The 20th Century Exodus"—first paragraph is paper's introduction]

[Text] **In recent months emigration from the USSR has turned into an avalanche. Predictions of the future give us little solace. ARGUMENTY I FAKTY correspondent D. Makarov discussed the issue of emigration with candidate of historical sciences B. Nosenko.**

[Nosenko] Indeed, we cannot but call the current situation threatening for our Union.

At a certain not-so-fine moment we may simply come to miss some of the nations that have lived next to us for centuries. Judge for yourselves: According to the official data of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, in 1989 235,400 citizens were granted permission to emigrate from the Soviet Union. Actually, 105,000 Germans, 9,500 Armenians (from Armenia), and 7,000 Greeks left the USSR. Thirteen thousand Soviet Jews resettled in Israel.

[Makarov] What is predicted for the future?

[Nosenko] According to the estimates of specialists, up to 200,000 Russians are expected to emigrate as soon as free emigration is introduced. However, it will apparently be the Jews who will break all records. Western sources predict that about 750,000 of them will emigrate in the immediate future. I am afraid that such predictions are well-founded. According to approximate data, in the first four months of this year about 30,000 people left for Israel, 45,000 Soviet Germans left for the FRG, and 4,000 Greeks left for Greece.

[Makarov] As you see it, what are the reasons for this rapid growth of emigration?

[Nosenko] They may be conventionally classified into four groups. The first group consists of reasons which are universal and statewide in nature. The country is seriously ill, and the people no longer feel that they have social protection.

The second group consists of nationality-specific reasons. For example, continuous difficulties with the restoration of the autonomous entity of the Germans are the reason for their mass emigration; the inability of the apparatus to restore peace in Transcaucasia is the reason for the emigration of Armenians.

The third group consists of personal reasons—marriages with foreign citizens, reunification with relatives residing abroad; and, finally, the fourth group—the impossibility of applying one's abilities within the country.

[Makarov] The Germans, Greeks, and Armenians began to leave relatively recently. The Jews have always been leaving. Why?

[Nosenko] Indeed, there have always been Jews willing to leave the Soviet Union. Their number has increased rapidly since the end of the 1960's.

Anti-Semitism is the main "ethnic" reason for their emigration. This phenomenon, which was widespread in Russia before the revolution, was never ultimately eradicated. They fought it only in the 1920's, and subsequently they resolved it by fiat in the Stalinist manner: There are Jews in the country, but there is no Jewish issue. The lingering prejudice was subsequently inflamed by Stalin's turn to anti-Semitism in domestic policy. Only his death spared the Jews wholesale deportations beyond the Ural Mountains which had actually been planned. Khrushchev "forgot" to mention this, and some people took his silence to be the unofficial affirmation of Stalin's policy on the Jewish issue.

For a while, anti-Semitism existed in the underground. Personnel department officers "disliked" Jews; they were not hired for jobs associated with travel abroad (they could fail to return!), and obstacles were erected to their admission to colleges.

By now, anti-Semitism has left the underground. Articles insulting the Jewish people appear in some periodical publications which have gained dubious notoriety.

[Makarov] Is this not likely to cause, putting it mildly, negative emotions with regard to their first motherland on the part of "our former" people in Israel?

[Nosenko] I was recently there on a scientific trip. I had many interesting meetings, but one thing I failed to encounter were anti-Russian sentiments. In general, a surprisingly involved attitude toward Russia continues to exist among the Israelis, including a segment of the ruling circles.

We are now discovering the Russian emigre community abroad. Let us not forget that in the Middle East there are a great number of those with whom we lived side by side for many years, sharing our joys and woes, all the more so because many of them strive to retain spiritual ties to the country where they were born. Another thing... if a man is given the right to emigrate, why then create conditions such that he carries with him resentment and bitterness? Nobody from among those leaving the USSR for good is deprived of his Soviet citizenship, except those leaving on Israeli visas. Given the current scope of emigration, direct flights to Israel would be nothing but the manifestation of a humane approach.

[Makarov] However, it is known that Arab countries come out sharply against the immigration of Soviet Jews to Israel.

[Nosenko] The protests of the Arabs are absolutely justified insofar as they come out against the settlement of their lands occupied in 1967. Despite the fact that only a small percentage of the immigrants have opted for residing on these lands, even isolated cases are impermissible because they violate the norms of international law. It is clear that a precise position on this issue is required of the Israeli Government. The government proposes plans "to develop" these territories instead, and thus casts a shadow over all immigration. As far as the emigration of Jews from the USSR to Israel proper is concerned, this involves only two countries, and in this matter the protests are not legitimate.

[Makarov] Nonetheless, don't you think that Jewish emigration undermines Soviet-Arab friendship?

[Nosenko] If friendship is built on a principled foundation, compliance by one of the parties with obligations entailed by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights cannot undermine it. I believe that worthy methods for counteracting the settlement of the occupied territories can be found, instead of threatening the Jews with introducing restrictions of the human rights which our perestroyka has already succeeded in ensuring for all the citizens of our country. Our previous criminal practices damaged the moral condition of our society too much, to say nothing of the international prestige of the state, for us to allow even a single step back and introduce, as one of our leaders said recently, "a limited measure of freedom and equality."

The more successfully the process of resolving the conflict in the Middle East develops, the sooner the issue of the settlement of the occupied territories will be eliminated. It is exactly on this path that we need to look for a solution to the problem which has arisen. As I see it, we should act by civilized political methods, primarily by invigorating policy in the Middle East, rather than by threatening to introduce bans which, incidentally, do nothing but promote emigration.

[Makarov] Are you trying to say that Soviet diplomacy has thus far not "done its best" in this sphere?

[Nosenko] The Soviet position on Middle Eastern affairs has recently begun to acquire constructive content. However, a confrontational, antiimperialist focus was the determinant of its essence for too long. This is why it is necessary to reveal all the blunders and mistakes that were allowed to occur and evaluate them objectively in order to fully liberate ourselves from old stereotypes. However, neither political scientists nor the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs itself are in a hurry to ultimately deal with the legacy of the past in this sphere. It is not surprising that to this day our Middle East policy lacks the balance to vigorously mediate the Arab-Israeli conflict, because we do not have adequate contacts with both parties to it.

Gorbachev, Military Men Sign Writer's Obituary

PM2007110390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Jul 90 Second Edition p 8

[Obituary of Valentin Savvich Pikul]

[Excerpts] Soviet literature has suffered a heavy loss. Valentin Savvich Pikul, the well-known writer, participant in the Great Patriotic War, and holder of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] A.M. Gorkiy State Prize, has died at the age of 62. [passage omitted]

[Signed] M.S. Gorbachev, Ch.T. Aytmatov, Yu.V. Bondarev, V.V. Gidaspov, N.N. Gubenko, A.Ya. Degtyarev, A.S. Dzasokhov, B.N. Yeltsin, E.Yu. Zimin, V.A. Ivashko, A.S. Kapto, V.V. Karpov, A.I. Lukyanov, S.V. Mikhalkov, V.I. Panin, N.K. Polozkov, Ye.M. Primakov, V.G. Rasputin, A.P. Rubiks, N.I. Ryzhkov, I.S. Silayev, I.T. Frolov, V.N. Chernavin, N.I. Shlyaga, D.T. Yazov.

Leaders Sign War Poet's Obituary

PM1807115990 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 18 Jul 90 Second Edition p 2

[Obituary of poet Mikhail Lvovich Matusovskiy]

[Excerpts] Our multiethnic culture has suffered a severe loss. The well-known Soviet poet Mikhail Lvovich Matusovskiy, a participant in the Great Patriotic War and a USSR State Prize winner, has passed away in his 75th year. [passage omitted]

[Signed] M.S. Gorbachev, Ch.T. Aytmatov, M.I. Aliger, I.K. Arkhipova, G.Ya. Baklanov, N.N. Gubenko, A.S. Dzasokhov, V.A. Ivashko, Ye.A. Isayev, V.I. Kazenin, A.S. Kapto, V.V. Karpov, A.I Lukyanov, S.V. Mikhalkov, A.N. Pakhmutova, I.K. Polozkov, Ye.M. Primakov, Yu.A. Prokofyev, V.G. Rasputin, N.I. Ryzhkov, E.A. Ryazanov, V.S. Ugarov, I.T. Frolov, T.N. Khrennikov, R.K. Shchedrin

Magazine Launches Russian-Language Edition

LD2007081190 Moscow TASS in English 0754 GMT 20 Jul 90

["Special to TASS" by Yvonne Conde]

[Text] New York July 20 TASS—Two publishers—New York's "BUSINESS WEEK" in New York and the Soviet Union's "KNIGA"—have joined forces on a new magazine BUSINESS WEEK/USSR. It will be the first major Russian language Western magazine published in the U.S.S.R.

The first issue was launched at a news conference held Thursday in New York City. Bimonthly issues will begin in September/October 1990 and monthly publication will begin from January 1991, with an initial circulation of 50,000 issues.

Soviet economists and editors will select and translate material appropiate for the Soviet Union from BUSINESS WEEK's and BUSINESS WEEK INTERNATIONAL's four monthly issues, covering a variety of business, industrial and economic news.

Production and distribution will originate in the Soviet Union. The magazine will be printed in Minsk.

Initially skeptical about the quality of the printing, BUSINESS WEEK's editor-in-chief Steve Shepard told TASS, "when the prototype issue came out we were really delighted by the high quality of this four-color magazine produced in the Soviet Union.

"We think BUSINESS WEEK/USSR is quite promising and as the changes proceed in the Soviet Union, and the Soviet Union is succesful in becoming more of a market economy, the magazine is going to be very successful," he added.

This is BUSINESS WEEK's third foreign language publication. The others are BUSINESS WEEK/CHINA and BUSINESS WEEK/HUNGARY.

Economic

Finance Minister Delivers Television Address

LD2307201590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1730 GMT 23 Jul 90

[Television address by USSR Finance Minister V.S. Pavlov from the program "In the Government of the USSR"—live or recorded]

[Text] I come before you today to discuss some of the most complex issues connected with market preparations in the finance and credit system, its internal restructuring, and the restructuring of its relationships with enterprises and the population. There is an accumulation of contradictions in this area, and there are very many questions that have not been fully resolved. These are questions which cannot be ignored either by our government program or by the population; they arouse great interest among people because they touch on the specific personal interests and pockets, so to speak, of every enterprise and every person.

I should say, quite frankly, that the financial and economic situation we are in today is far from easy. This is to be expected, because, as you know, where manufacturing is concerned things are not going smoothly, and the same is true of the correlation between the funds at the disposal of enterprises and the population on the one hand, and the material resources and services available for this money on the other hand. In connection with this, preparing for the market entails carrying out a whole series of major preliminary steps in order to enable both enterprises and people to prepare themselves, and to create a mechanism to provide a certain protection for those unable to protect themselves once the market conditions come along.

We ended the year—the half-year today—the first half-year with a budget deficit of R24 billion. But what is especially important is that we have a surplus of income over expenditure in republican and local budgets of approximately R6,000 million. This is the realization in practice of a new finance policy aimed at strengthening the income base of local soviets, above all, and of the republics, in order to strengthen their real base for making decisions of a social nature and for resolving pressing regional problems, and, in general, to make it possible for local authorities' actions to, as they say, match the possibilities they may have available to turn their wishes and decisions into reality.

So what can be said about the restructuring in this respect of our work for the second half-year? In the second half-year we will continue to work to maintain a balanced budget and raise the cost of credit, although what is now becoming evident is the need to accelerate the implementation of major measures involving our relationship with the population.

I would say that first and foremost today we consider it necessary to enact measures for the social protection of the family. We have worked out a program to support children irrespective of where the child was born and what its family is like. Our approach is based on the principle that from birth a person should feel the protection of the state. This program today costs about R10 billion, and we already proceed from the assumption that the most important objective is to start putting it into practice, because during discussions on this question, we have already received support on virtually all parts of the program from the republics. But we want program proposals, such as, for example, a child payment of R35 per month if the income of family members is less than R140 per month. We would like to start this program as of 1 September, but in this case, obviously, in the new financial situation of distribution of incomes, the Union government will not be able to implement this program. We have thus turned to the republics with a proposal that they also take part in supporting, so to speak, the enactment of this program this year by their own means: In other words, to combine our efforts, even though the means are not abundant either here or there. They should still be combined in order to tackle this major economic task.

I consider it my duty as minister of finance to tell you today that we are thinking in general about protecting the incomes of the population from the point of view of their savings under the conditions of a market economy. It is very important here, as I see it, for us to gain a mutual understanding that we do not intend to carry out a monetary reform, but rather a major action to ensure that someone who has accumulated R1,000 for his old age does not have half of that R1,000 swallowed up by inflation the next day.

So what we have in mind is that this complex protection program will affect both the population's deposits in savings banks and in insurance policies, and the money

that people have invested in state loans of various kinds. We assume that the main direction should be maintaining balance first and foremost from the viewpoint of a onetime change in prices. If we go for a onetime change in retail prices, then deposits should correspondingly be reevaluated. To put it crudely, if someone has R1,000 and prices rise by 30 percent, then his deposit in the savings bank should be reviewed accordingly, and it should be recorded that he has saved not 1,000 but 1,300. Apart from that, we understand that under conditions of the market, obviously—and especially at the first stage—there will also be ongoing price increases. Obviously we need to be protected from that rise in prices by higher interest rates on the deposits we will make. I think my assessment is that the average interest rate on deposits for the population should be somewhere between five and seven percent, but that is the average: it does not mean that it cannot be higher, i.e. on individual deposits, we could pay eight, 10, and even 12 percent, depending on the period for which the person lends this money to the state, and on what conditions.

I have to say that we must also resolve a whole number of issues, as I have already said, involving loans and insurance. For example, we have already resolved several practical questions. As you know, on treasury bonds we have now adopted a decision to pay an annual income at the level of ten percent: that is to say, we pay a person ten rubles a year for every hundred, if he has treasury bonds that he has bought from the state. What we have in mind is that on specific purpose loans, so to speak,—for example, loans linked to refrigerators, television sets, and other consumer durables that have become popular among the collectives—that those things will be given out to the population at the prices that existed at the time the loan was purchased, and the individual will not have to pay any additional amount. The government has already virtually adopted that decision today.

We are also working now on the fulfillment of another obligation which is linked to this problem. We were assigned the task by the Supreme Soviet of finding resources in order to... [changes thought] The 1954-1956 loans that remained unredeemed since that time nevertheless did not fall within our program for the transition to the market. All the same, we do have to settle our outstanding accounts with our fathers and mothers before we embark upon the market. Evidently the opportunity must be found here and accounts must be settled in full on these loans during the second half of the year.

Evidently I must also mention today a major action that is linked to the restructuring of the financial and credit system as an organization. Under the conditions of the market economy the system changes completely from the viewpoint of its initial premise. The collective becomes interested not only in increasing income but in retaining the greater part of this income at its own disposal. Hence, there often comes into being the desire to retain for common needs, as they say—this is indicated by the universal practice, including our own practice, at certain times—quite simply this means getting what doesn't belong to you; what we generally call unearned resources. In this sense the system, I would say, has to guarantee that it will not enable nonlabor incomes to develop. In this sense we have today virtually completed the establishment of taxation inspection departments which were unfortunately eliminated completely about 30 years ago. But we have already put together about 75 percent of them, and although this is a very complicated task, these taxation inspection departments are already getting down to their work today.

We have already embarked upon the restructuring of our credit system upon the principles of a system operating at two levels: that is to say, the State Bank as the country's single issuing office and center; and commercial, joint-stock banks at the second level. In this sense the restructuring of the banking system and monetary affairs is a very complex and delicate issue, I would say, and everyone must have a clear idea of the fact that it is precisely on account of the complexity and the delicate nature of this question that the approach to it must be a very cautious and delicate one. Money, after all, is, I would say, if not the blood of the economy, it represents the arteries of the economy which embrace all links in the national economy and without which it is simply impossible today to talk about a single market, about a single interest, about equivalent exchange. In other words, quite simply, one cannot talk at all about a transition to a market economy if we do not have a single monetary and financial and credit system.

In this sense democracy and the desire to expand the rights of the enterprise and its place, the individual, and the spirit of enterprise in the country—all of this must be backed up by a sufficient restructuring of the financial and credit system. In this sense we would like the measures which we are going to implement in the fields of restructuring the financial and credit system, support for the population and protection of its incomes against devaluation, provision of incentives for enterprise and earning, to meet with understanding and support from our people, too.

Thank you for your attention.

Ryzhkov Delivers Report on Market Reform

PM2307114590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 Jul 90 Morning Edition pp 1, 2

[Report: "N.I. Ryzhkov's Report at the 20 July 1990 Joint Sitting of the Presidential Council and the Council of the Federation"; first paragraph is IZVESTIYA introduction]

[Text] As reported earlier, a joint sitting of the Presidential Council and the Council of the Federation was held on 20 July this year to discuss the question of organizational measures to implement the economic reform and switch to market relations. Today IZVESTIYA publishes N.I. Ryzhkov's report at the sitting.

Esteemed comrades! I could begin my report with the specific proposals for organizing work connected with the transition to a market economy. These have been drawn up, but I will try to explain them, as far as possible, a little later. For the moment I would like to say that having weighed over and over again the potential of all the structures of state management, I have arrived at the conclusion that success in the practical implementation of our plans will depend, both today and in the foreseeable future, on the situation that is taking shape in our country. Its present complexity is obvious, and its increasingly profound impact on the transitional processes toward the market must not be underestimated.

The 28th party congress has ended, having adopted a Program Statement, statutes, and a number of resolutions, including a resolution on the CPSU's policy in implementing the economic reform and switching to market relations.

At the same time it has to be seen that a polarization of social movements is taking place in the country, organizations opposed to a constructive policy are becoming more active, overt calls to overthrow the existing state system have rung out, and interethnic conflicts are continuing.

The mounting crisis in the economy is still further intensifying social tension and, naturally, this is creating fertile ground for conflicts.

These are the conditions in which we will have to elaborate and implement the program for the stabilization of the economy and transition to market relations. The conditions, I repeat again, are extremely complex.

Therefore, in parallel with the preparation of the program for the transition to a market economy, we can in no way avoid intensive work on numerous current issues which are particularly acute at the present moment. Their solution must contribute to preventing a further deterioration of the situation in the country.

Naturally, this applies above all to questions connected with the stabilization of the consumer market, social support for the population, and the creation of conditions for the normal functioning of the national economy next year.

We are particularly concerned at the moment with the state of affairs in the agro-industrial complex and primarily the organization of procurement of this year's harvest. A good harvest is expected in the main agricultural regions. Harvesting work has started in virtually all the Union republics. Grain yields are substantially higher than last year.

We are taking all measures to promptly resolve the questions which arise daily in this sphere and regarding deliveries of fuel, spare parts, and machinery. At the same time the fact that grain is not reaching the state granaries is causing serious concern. As of 16 July 7.5 million tonnes of grain had been purchased. This is approximately 10 percent of the target. Allow me to remind you that we are hoping to purchase 85 million tonnes for state stocks. Last year, when the harvest was not so good, 12.7 million tonnes had been purchased by this date. There may be a repetition of last year, when we procured only 59 million tonnes and were forced to buy and import around 44 million tonnes of grain.

Unless the situation is changed radically, I declare responsibly, the country will not be able to purchase this quantity of grain. We are currently in a dire foreign currency situation. Therefore we absolutely must purchase for state stocks the quantity necessary to feed the people—this is approximately 60 million tonnes, and a further 25 million tonnes are needed to fully supply the Ptitseprom [Poultry Industry Administration] and major livestock complexes with mixed feed.

I decided to dwell in particular on this question in view of the fact that republic heads and prime ministers of all the Union republics are present here. An unfavorable situation is also taking shape regarding deliveries of food products to the trade network. During the first half of the year production of them increased by only 1.7 percent. The shortfall in the delivery of food products to the trade network totals almost R2 billion. Enterprises are not accepting the set plans and are not concluding contracts. Delivery discipline has sharply deteriorated.

I want to take advantage of our meeting today in order to cite a few figures. We are not satisfied with progress concerning nonfood goods either, but production and deliveries of these goods to the trade network during the first half of the year nonetheless increased by 15 percent in comparison with the first half of last year. Here are a few figures so that you can form a picture of this growth. I am aware of the negative emotions evoked in people by figures about increased output of goods while store shelves remain empty. But that is a different topic.

For instance, the output of tape recorders has increased by 126 percent, television sets by 113 percent, videocassette recorders by 220 percent, synthetic detergents by 10 percent, and mini-tractors and motorized cultivators by 45 percent. That is, changes for the better have nonetheless taken place in this sphere. This is a consequence both of the conversion which we are implementing and also of the persistent efforts which we are making in the production of consumer goods. Still these improvements fail to satisfy us. There are no such improvements regarding food, where the increase is 1.7 percent, or, in physical terms, approximately one percent—the figure by which the country's population is growing. Therefore no improvement of food supplies can be expected at this rate, and social tension will continue to mount.

Among other current issues, I would like to dwell on one more problem. Of late the problem connected with the export from the country of consumer goods, including food, has become particularly acute in western oblasts. Vast differences between the level of prices in our country and the countries of East Europe have greatly

swelled the flood of people who enter our country or travel to these countries solely for speculative purposes. All the measures taken to tighten customs controls have failed to produce the required effect and are only evoking mounting dissatisfaction among the population of border oblasts.

I would like to cite a few figures. Yesterday I signed a resolution temporarily suspending the application of a government decision adopted in 1988.

The prevailing situation is illustrated by the following data on the confiscation of contraband on the Western border during the first half of 1990:

	Outward traffic (totals)
Foreign currency (freely convertible)	561,000
Soviet currency	7,825,000
Diamonds	295,000
Gold and platinum articles	5,403,000
Silver articles	300,000
Household appliances	991,000
Consumer goods	2,085,000
Total according to Customs data	18,164,000

The government has adopted a decision to temporarily suspend the government resolution of September 1988 until the internal market has stabilized. We realize that the reaction to this will be mixed, but I must say that this situation is also troubling our western partners. You may have seen in a recent "120 Minutes" program on television what is happening in Czechoslovakia: It is flooded with our goods, speculation is rife, and the Czechoslovak internal affairs organs simply cannot cope.

And there is another group of questions to which the USSR Council of Ministers Presidium is currently attending very closely. They are connected with compiling the draft plan for 1991. They cannot be postponed until September when the program for the transition to a market economy will be ready. Enterprises must actively compile their production programs right now and conclude contracts with consumers and suppliers of material and technical resources.

Therefore, without waiting for the adoption of legislative acts regulating procedures for the implementation of work and deliveries for state needs, the government is consistently adopting decisions on measures to ensure material balance in 1991 for all national economic complexes in market conditions. That is, we are examining every complex, making decisions, and immediately notifying enterprises how they should behave in 1991. Next Tuesday and Wednesday we will discuss certain questions with the chairmen of Union republics.

The overall approach here is based on the need to resolve two interlinked tasks. First of all, it is necessary to expand as far as possible the enterprises' autonomy in line with the law which has been adopted, and to create conditions for shaping a market in the means of production. At the same time, it is necessary to limit deliveries for state needs to the minimum level of resources needed for stable functioning by the entire national economy, and primarily its priority spheres—the agro-industrial complex and nonproduction sectors, and to secure the needs of defense and the fulfillment of interstate commitments.

We are simultaneously working on questions of stepping up economic incentives for deliveries to meet state needs and organizing food supplies for the population, and on the entire package of problems associated with foreign economic activity in the light of the new principles of building the federation. Appropriate solutions will be examined in the very near future with the Union republics, and serious decisions on them will have to be urgently made.

But of course, the main element of all the work that is now under way—in terms of both its importance and its extent—is the preparation of the entire package of documents for the USSR Supreme Soviet's fall session.

On the basis of clarifying the concept of transition to the market, with due consideration for the recommendations elaborated by Union and autonomous republic Supreme Soviets and the proposals made by USSR Supreme Soviet members, we must submit a draft program for shaping the structure and mechanism of the market economy, as well as drafts of the relevant legislative acts and normative documents.

We have never before done this type of work on such a scale and in such a tight time frame.

About 20 legislative acts will have to be prepared on questions of the population's social protection alone, and—according to even the most modest estimates—almost 100 decisions will have to be made at government, presidential, and USSR Supreme Soviet level. This does not include decisions which will have to be made by Union republics.

At this point I would like to emphasize an exceptionally important point which is crucial for the total success of the work that has been launched. The government believes that we must not arrive at the USSR Supreme Soviet with numerous options for the program for transition to the market—the Ryzhkov option, the Yeltsin option, the Nazarbayev option, figuratively speaking—but with a single coordinated action program. This requires the consolidation of all our efforts. We are living in a single state and we need a single program, a single base, which later on will of course reflect to a certain extent the specific features of each Union republic.

We have already taken the initial steps toward changing the actual style of the government's work. You know that representatives of all Union republic governments have

been brought into the USSR Council of Ministers Presidium, and that social organizations are getting involved in the Union government's work. We believe that the eight largest social organizations must systematically work in the government during the discussion of various questions.

A commission for appraising alternative options for the transition to the market economy has been formed under Academician A.G. Aganbegyan's leadership.

And now about the content of the work we will have to complete within this tight time frame.

It is, naturally, impossible within the framework of a single report not only to examine in detail but even to just list the entire package of measures needed for shaping the market in the country. I already mentioned their quantity. There are, however, also five sets of problems encompassing fundamental questions which must be solved within the preparatory period, in other words, by the beginning of 1991. It is they that will create the legal, economic, and organizational skeleton of the future market economy. Unless this is done, there can be no real movement toward the market. We are talking, first, about decentralization of ownership, destatization of the economy, and every possible support for enterprise.

Second, the reform of price formation. Third, the problem of improving the health of finances and the monetary system.

Fourth, the package of measures for social support of the population.

And finally, last on the list but probably the most important problem—mutual relations between the Union and the republics, demarcation of their powers, and coordination of actions. Everything that should be the subject of the new Union treaty's economic section.

In its work on the program for the transition to a regulated market economy, the government is persistently seeking ways to solve the aforementioned problems. Specific proposals on them are being prepared at present.

Primarily on destatization and the development of enterprise.

There is no need to adduce proof that the market will function and its inherent forces will operate only provided it becomes the arena for actions by free commodity producers bearing full responsibility for the results of economic management. The action program in this sphere suggests the following measures.

During July and August we intend to prepare and adopt decisions on the transformation of a sizable number of state enterprises into joint-stock corporations, providing specific lists of such enterprises, and to accelerate the implementation of the USSR Law on Leasing and Lease Relations with a view to expanding the range of state property which can be leased.

A resolution on the development of small enterprises and their support by the state is virtually complete, and we will adopt this document next week.

Recommendations are being elaborated for republics and local soviets aimed at helping them to implement resolute measures for the destatization of enterprises in trade, public catering, consumer services, and other sectors, including their sale or lease to labor collectives, families, and individual citizens. And the main role here will have to be played by the republics.

We attach major importance to these measures. Specifically, the large-scale destatization of trade is one of the necessary conditions for doing away with the distributive system, the development of competition, the stepping up of the consumer's influence on production, and the stabilization of the consumer market. In our opinion, these questions can be solved as regards the bulk of stores and other outlets in trade and public catering as early as the end of next year. It is obvious that this is up to local soviets and their initiative.

The appropriate organizational-methodological base is also being prepared simultaneously. For example, work is being done on the methods for valuing the property of enterprises due to be converted to joint stockholding, leasing, or buyout [vykup]. The USSR Gosbank will issue in the very near future an instruction on the provision of credits, including preferential credits, for the purchase of state property by legal and physical persons.

A procedure is being elaborated for the utilization of funds acquired as a result of the transformation of state enterprises into joint stock corporations or of their leasing. It is intended to use such funds to repay the state debt.

In the next few days the government will submit a draft USSR presidential decree on the creation of a special organ to manage state property. Its powers will specifically include questions concerning the proportion of shares and nature of enterprises which should remain in the state's hands, how such enterprises will be managed, and how shares will be allocated.

As I already said, we intend to solve all these questions already during July and August.

Now a few words about enterprise. If we really want to develop and support it, then measures are necessary to change society's negative attitude to the entrepreneur. Therefore, in addition to the draft Law on Freedom of Economic Activity in the USSR which we will submit to the Supreme Soviet toward September, there is a need before this for a major state act declaring the entrepreneur's rights and his protection by the state and

explaining the importance of the social functions which he fulfills. I believe that a presidential decree on this subject is needed.

Apart from this it is necessary by September-October at the latest to introduce amendments to the articles of the criminal and civil code which provide for punishing entrepreneurial activity.

If honest, socially responsible entrepreneurs are to emerge in our country, firm legal guarantees are necessary. Therefore the government supports the proposals of prominent legal experts on the need for an urgent reworking of the civil code as a whole, in order to turn it into the main legal regulator of economic and market relations, as is the case throughout the world.

The second key problem is the reform of price formation.

As is known, the option submitted by the government is being criticized from all sides and society has reacted badly to it. At the same time we cannot postpone the reform of price formation any longer and we adhere to our positions. No matter how much criticism there is, we believe that the economic reform will not advance unless everything necessary is done in the sphere of price formation. If we postpone the price reform again—that is, the reform of wholesale, retail, and procurement prices—I believe that in general to expect further development of the economic reform, still less a transition to market relations, would be totally unrealistic. So that, as I have said before, any further postponement is impossible. The transition in the longer term to prices which are predominantly regulated by demand and supply is an inalienable element of the market.

Therefore the program will present alternative options for a price reform, their consequences, and a mechanism for social protection, taking account of what has been proposed by scientists, experts, and the public. The draft Law on Price Formation in the USSR which is currently being compiled will be finalized on the basis of the results of the discussion of these options. Among other issues, this draft law is also to resolve the question of the demarcation of the functions of the USSR Council of Ministers and the governments of Union republics in the price formation sphere.

On this basis the governments of the USSR and Union republics will have to adopt a decision on the specific range of goods and services whose prices and tariffs are subject to approval and state regulation, on the expansion of the zone of free price formation, on the implementation of a coordinated financial policy to prevent price hikes, inflation, and a deterioration of people's living standards.

But perhaps the most difficult and complex problem at the present stage is the problem of improving the health of finances and the monetary system. We have been talking for a long time about the importance of this problem, but so far we have only made it worse through our joint efforts. The Union government is in a very difficult position: Revenue from taxation is declining while expenditure is growing under the impact of countless demands. However, to satisfy these demands in practice, to satisfy them really, rather than just by printing more money, it is necessary to improve the economy, increase output, and to this end to remove, by all available methods, surplus money from circulation. Unless we summon up the strength and determination to implement these measures, any price reform option will merely exacerbate inflation and the distortions in the economy and produce negative sociopolitical consequences.

It is above all a question of reducing the state budget deficit. On the government's instructions, proposals for additional measures in this sphere in the current year have been drawn up. They include measures such as excluding from plans the financing of construction projects which have not been started yet, a further reduction of management costs, primarily at the expense of structures whose effectiveness has sharply declined in the current situation, cuts in our aid to foreign countries, and a reduction in expenditure on export-import operations.

At the same time all the questions connected with the formation of the budget for 1991 are being studied. You know that the formation of the budget for 1991 will be totally different from the principles which applied previously. There will be the state budget and there will be separate Union republic budgets. But I must warn you in advance that we must not delude ourselves and hope that the deficit can be totally eliminated. Our budget is increasingly acquiring a social thrust. For instance, in the current year the share of social resources in overall budget expenditure totals 65.7 percent. So that on the whole the potential for reducing state expenditure is very limited.

Furthermore the government intends to make use of all existing proposals to tie up the free funds of the population and enterprises—joint-stock ownership, sales of housing, leasing, the flotation of loans, and so forth.

A decision has been adopted to enhance the attractiveness of treasury bills and commodity loan bonds for the population. Thus the term of the loan has been reduced and the rate of interest payable to the population has been increased from five to 10 percent.

In the near future a decision will be adopted on raising the rate of interest on the population's savings bank deposits.

However, even bearing all this is mind, we must not overrate the ability and willingness of broad strata of the population to loan their savings to the state.

We must be prepared for the fact that the aforementioned measures will not be sufficient to limit the supply of money in circulation, and special measures will be necessary in order to prevent inflation from spiraling.

I must specify straightaway that most of them will not only not cause general delight, but on the contrary, will run into serious opposition. They can by no means be described as popular. But our present situation is such that there are no simple solutions to this problem.

In the near future the government will submit to the USSR Supreme Soviet draft laws on the USSR Gosbank [State Bank], banks, and banking activities.

I would like to say that the first steps toward the establishment of a modern banking system have already been taken. Thus the USSR Zhilsotsbank [USSR Bank for Housing and Municipal Services and Social Development] and the USSR Agroprombank [USSR Agro-Industrial Bank] are being transformed into commercial joint-stock banks by decision of the government.

This measures aroused a negative reaction in Union republics.

But this is completely unfounded. The Union government is prepared constructively to discuss the question of the dividing the package of shares in these banks which belongs to the state between the Union and republics. They will be able to invest their resources in banking on the new basis.

The government is at present seriously concerned at the recent tendency manifested by certain republics, and in particular the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic], to adopt decisions which essentially lead to the destruction of the integrated banking system in the country. It must be understood that all this will primarily affect the life and work of the republics themselves.

A great deal of work is to be carried out in order to establish a system of reliable social protection for the population in connection with the transition to a market economy. A whole package of draft legislative acts and resolutions is in preparation with a view to providing an organizational and legal basis for such a system.

Measures compensating the population for their losses during those options for retail price reform that entail a one-shot revision of prices will be an organic component of the government program.

The mechanism of index-linking incomes to the current increase in consumer prices, which will be formed without restrictions in the future on the basis of supply and demand, is designed to play an important role in the system of social protection for the population. In the immediate future proposals must be submitted to the USSR Council of Ministers on the procedure for index-linking incomes, along with projections for the average minimum consumer budget for the USSR, the Union republics, and major regions. Before the end of this year it will be necessary not only to adopt decisions on this question but also to carry out all the requisite organizational and methodological work in order to activate the index-linking mechanism, where necessary, as of the beginning of 1991. Moreover, the draft normative act on the procedure for concluding collective contracts which is being elaborated by a number of departments, along with the AUCCTU [All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions] and interested organizations, must reflect questions of compensation at enterprise level.

The government attaches particular importance to the elaboration and adoption of a package of measures for the social protection of the most vulnerable strata of the population: low-income citizens and invalids. Besides the compensation for the one-shot consumer price hike and income index-linking, which will embrace the whole population, it is planned that real steps will be taken to provide social protection for socially weak strata of the population. The USSR Council of Ministers is currently examining a draft normative act on social protection for low-income citizens which is above all designed to improve the material position of families with a large number of children.

We have discussed these proposals with the chairmen of the Union republic Councils of Ministers. There was a proposal to embark on this step as of 1 January next year, since the decisions on material assistance for the third child, fourth child, and so on were adopted back in 1944 (amounting to R4 per child). The average wages were then R38, whereas today, as is well known, they are R240. A proposal has been submitted for republic budgets to assume half of the expenditure arising from this. I do not think that we need to provide any explanation now as to the timely nature of this step.

USSR draft laws on social protection for invalids and social security are in the final stages of preparation.

To conclude this subject, I would like to inform the members of the Presidential Council and the Council of the Federation about the steps we have taken to improve the material position of cultural, health, and public education personnel. As is well known, it has already been decided to increase their wages, but the increasing lag between the level of labor remuneration for these categories of workers and sectors in the production sphere (cultural personnel are paid 60 percent of the average wage in material production) and the need to intensify their social protection during the transition to market relations make it necessary to bring the date for the implementation of these measures forward to early 1991, instead of 1992-1994 as prescribed by previous resolutions.

The provision of constitutional guarantees of the right to work represents another area in the protection of people's fundamental interests.

The elaboration of a Law on Employment in the USSR is among the fundamental measures here. It is intended that this law will regulate only the fundamental, most important questions relating to provision of guarantees for the right to work common to all citizens of the USSR, irrespective of the republic in which they live. This

approach, notwithstanding its uniform resolution of general, fundamental questions of employment in the country, provides extensive scope for individual republics to consider the specific conditions that have taken shape within them in this sphere and to adopt the requisite additional measures.

Along with the Law on Employment, the drafts of a number of normative acts that will also reflect measures to regulate various aspects of labor relations are in preparation. They include the aforementioned act on the procedure for concluding collective contracts, on changing legislation on labor and labor collectives, on the procedure for resolving individual labor disputes, on broadening judicial defense of citizens' labor rights, and on social protection for working people during the implementation of conversion in defense sectors of industry.

With a view to providing the proper organizational preconditions for work on the job placement of citizens in conditions of a market economy, a draft USSR Council of Ministers resolution on setting up a state employment service in the USSR is being elaborated. This service is to be developed at an extremely fast pace. The aim is for this service to be able to take on in 1991 the main workload with regard to citizens' job placement.

Without doubt, measures to ensure employment cannot be confined just to regulating labor relations. The actual sphere of the application of labor must also be broadened and the material basis for the job placement of people released from inefficient enterprises must be set up. The development of small enterprises will perhaps be of crucial significance here.

I would particularly like to dwell on fundamental questions relating to the transition to the market in the sphere of the agro-industrial complex. It is planned to discuss them with the participation of the heads of government of all Union republics. It will above all be a question of three key problems, work on which must begin immediately.

First and foremost, there is the shaping of food stocks. As is well known, the bulk of food entering state resources is concentrated in the hands of the center and distributed by the center to consumers. Republics, krays, and oblasts receive state orders for deliveries of produce.

Under the current changed conditions this practice requires radical revision. The government's position is that the Union should retain control merely over the shaping and distribution of food resources and raw materials required for all-Union needs. These include the requirements of the Army and special consumers and the creation of state reserves and carryover funds, including for export. I must say that there is no single opinion as yet about what to do about supplies to Moscow and Leningrad, nor about subsidies to individual Union republics. We advocate that at the transitional stage the union retain control of interrepublic shipments (subsidies). All-Union stocks should be shaped to this end.

Now I will dwell on purchase prices. The government has drawn up a draft resolution which has largely been coordinated with the Union republics. Single prices are introduced for grain, oilseeds, sugar beet, and so forth. The number of price zones for livestock products is being reduced somewhat.

Basic prices include the markups that are currently paid. Full compensation is being provided for agriculture's additional expenditure in connection with the rise in wholesale prices for industrial output and tariffs for services.

There can be two solutions in this area. One is to adopt the prepared draft, bearing in mind that it is only designed to cover the transitional period, while the other solution is to establish state purchase prices purely for the agricultural produce for which the regulation of retail prices remains within the competence of the center. This applies to grain and grain products, meat, dairy products, vegetable oil, sugar, baby food, cotton fiber, flax fiber, and wool. For other types of products the setting of purchase prices is to be transferred to the Union republics. We are still exchanging opinions with republic governments on these questions.

I will now move on to the system of material and technical supply to the agro-industrial complex. We have been literally assailed by agrarian deputies and deputies from the constituent Peasant Congress. They are demanding that we adopt a resolution transferring the Agrosnab [expansion unknown] with all its subordinate organizations from the USSR Gossnab [State Committee for Material and Technical Supply] to the State Commission for Food and Purchases. Furthermore it is planned to allocate to the Glavagrosnab [expansion unknown] the functions of sole repository of the resources centrally allocated for the agro-industrial complex. This is a fundamental question and we clearly need to exchange opinions on this today. Of course, if the republics all support this, the decisions will be adopted by the government. We realize that at the height of the harvest it would be inexpedient to take this step. But this will be done later.

As for providing villages with basic equipment, we propose that in the transitional period it [presumably the state commission] retain control over state deliveries (that is, the order passed on to enterprises).

We are elaborating a number of fundamental decisions in the sphere of foreign economic activity. As is well known, in recent years there have been major changes in this area, particularly on questions of decentralization. Around 14,000 enterprises and organizations are now entitled to operate in the foreign market. Export activity in the country has grown very considerably. And in order

to maintain our domestic market we have been forced to license and introduce quotas on a number of basic types of output.

At the same time, particularly at the end of last year and during this year, the country's foreign-exchange position has deteriorated sharply. In the immediate future we, together with the Union republics, will have to elaborate a clear-cut system of practical measures reflecting the interests of producer enterprises, republics, and the center.

And it is not, of course, a question of mechanically determining the proportion of foreign-currency revenue. Everything should be closely bound up with responsibility at each level of economic management for the resolution of socioeconomic problems on the basis of foreign exchange received.

Comrades! The success of such a large-scale turnaround in economic policy is linked to a considerable and perhaps decisive extent with the coordination of the actions of both the center and all the Union republics.

A new Union treaty is currently being drawn up and should provide a coordinated solution to many fundamental questions. But even before it has been concluded the republics are proclaiming their independence and sovereignty and are refusing to carry out the demands of the Union government and laws that are still in force.

I can understand their aspirations and their desire to free themselves from tutelage and to act independently. But I want to draw attention to the fact that such actions, sometimes hurriedly implemented, harm not only the Union authorities, but other authorities too, and sometimes even harm themselves.

The main thing is that, as a result, economic chaos is getting worse and the general crisis which affects everyone is intensifying. And the idea that we can get out of this crisis on our own or at the expense of our neighbors is not just mistaken. It is dangerous because of its unpredictable consequences.

I think that these actions do not accord with the realities of the present day, still less with the long-term tasks facing the country. They are attempts to approach the new tasks and new conditions using yesterday's yardsticks. We should seek solutions based on the criteria of sensible expediency.

The transition to the market economy is, after all, a way of improving its efficiency. And if the aim is appreciated sufficiently clearly, it will be logical for each republic to strive precisely for a single all-Union market rather than for isolated republic markets. All world experience of development has demonstrated quite obviously the advantages of a large-scale market for improving the efficiency of the national economy.

And if this is so, it follows that, first, enterprises in this united all-Union market must act as equal partners and the economic conditions for their functioning in different republics should basically be the same. Second—and this is of the most fundamental importance for the market—the republics' monetary and credit system should remain united and there should be no customs barriers between them.

If certain republics introduce their own monetary and credit systems they will be taking a step toward completely leaving the all-Union market and the Soviet economic system—with all the corresponding political consequences.

All these ideas should be carefully weighed up and comprehensively taken into account when concluding the new Union treaty, which will define the economic management functions of Union and republics.

Consequently, it would be very important to review the structure of the organs of state management in the USSR. Of course, this question requires detailed study and a consideration of the characteristics of the transfer to the market economy. Such work, in the USSR Government's view, could be based on the following principles.

First, the system of Union and republic organs is formed in accordance with legislative acts of the USSR and Union republics on the basis of the aims and tasks of each level.

Second, it is not the reorganization but the formation of a largely fundamentally new system of organs of state management geared to meeting statewide needs, including the defense of the country's sovereignty and citizens' rights and freedoms, the implementation of social and general economic functions, and the regulation of processes in conditions of the establishment of an all-Union market, that is carried out at all-Union level.

Third, the abolition of the system of enterprises' departmental affiliation in view of their complete autonomy, demands for the demonopolization of production and sales, and the development of enterprise. The only exception, of course, is those sectors with special management conditions. All this certainly must not be replaced by new structures which are essentially the same as the old ones but at Union republic level instead.

Fourth, associations and concerns must be the main organizational form of all-Union organs and the remaining ministries will be given qualitatively new functions and ensure in their own sphere conditions for the effective functioning of an all-Union regulated market. Here there must be a definitive separation of functions of state leadership and direct economic management. State organs of management will be required to comprehensively develop the market infrastructure and scientific-technical, supply-sales, and other organizations working on a contract basis, which are the successors to the economic functions now performed by ministerial apparatuses.

Fifth, cooperation between Union and republic organs of state management in implementing statewide socioeconomic policy takes place primarily on the basis of agreements and contracts as well as joint participation in the most important national economic programs. With this aim it is planned to allocate to each all-Union state organ of management a certain sum of appropriations in the annual budget. These appropriations are to be used to develop sectors or spheres of activity.

Sixth, encouraging the formation in each subsector of material production of several competing organizational structures and supporting the development of alternative forms of production units and small enterprises.

On the basis of those principles, a new system of management could be implemented during 1990-1991, consistently transforming the present structures in keeping with the level of development of market relations.

Here the USSR Government does not propose waiting for the adoption of the Union treaty. It will submit a number of its ideas at the same time as the program for transition to the market economy, that is, by 1 September this year. Practical steps will be taken in the sphere of decentralizing administration, developing market structures, and destatizing ownership, including transferring it to the joint-stock form.

At present proposals have already been prepared with regard to the USSR Ministry of the Chemical and Petroleum Refining Industry and the USSR Ministry of the Machine Tool and Tool Building Industry on the creation on the basis of their enterprises of a number of associations and concerns. USSR Council of Ministers standing organs are working on draft decisions on restructuring management in other spheres, too. This envisages the formation in the main of joint-stock companies with the state retaining a controlling share initially, or more precisely for the transitional period.

Comrades! The draft laws whose adoption is necessary for the transfer of the economy to market relations will be submitted by the government to the USSR Supreme Soviet before the beginning of the fall session. They are designed to regulate questions of economic activity and enterprise, the population's employment, price formation, the index-linking of incomes, foreign investments on USSR territory, banks and the banking system, joint-stock and other business companies, stocks, and the stock market.

The examination of questions in accordance with the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium resolution is planned for the fall session this year. We hope that these draft laws will be adopted as a priority. However, mindful of the experience of the passage of laws in the USSR Supreme Soviet, it is clear that a number of draft laws may not be adopted at the fall session. Therefore on certain questions without which the market economy cannot function normally, it is necessary to adopt provisional USSR Council of Ministers resolutions. These resolutions will thereafter lose force as the USSR Supreme Soviet adopts the corresponding legislative acts.

We believe that a number of particularly important proposals relating to key questions of the transfer to a market economy must be presented in the president's name in the form of presidential decrees. Of course, they must be determined by the powers which the president possesses and the government does not.

What does this mean, in our view?

First. In August the president could publish the basic provisions of the program for the destatization of the economy and the development of various forms of ownership.

Second. In September the president could put forward a decree on enterprise in the USSR and on state support for it.

Third. Also in September it would be expedient to come out in support of measures to reduce budget spending for 1990.

Fourth. We would regard as extremely important a statement by the president on financial and credit policy and on emergency measures in this sphere in connection with the transition to market relations.

Comrades!

Now about what the Union republics have, in our view, to resolve. They are faced with no less complex problems in connection with the transition to a market. I mean not so much our joint work on the program, where their very active and committed involvement is needed, as the elaboration and realization of measures in those spheres of activity which, in accordance with the principles of the republics' sovereignty, will be entirely within their competence.

Whatever concept of the reform of price formation and social protection of the population we ultimately arrive at, one thing is clear—that the bulk of the work in this sphere will fall to republic and local organs. This problem will have its own complexity in practically every republic, and it is simply pointless to seek unified prescriptions here.

I believe that the republics must begin preparing right now for the further decentralization of property (republican into communal) and draw up programs for the destatization of both. And, obviously, there can hardly be a unified scheme here, apart from the most general fundamental approaches.

Questions connected with the practical implementation of tax reform and the delimitation of budget income and expenditure between the republics and their constituent structures are already on the agenda in all the republics, naturally with due regard for their territorial-administrative setup.

As is known, the procedure whereby enterprises pay a tax of 45 percent on profits has now been approved by law. True, certain comrades from the Union republics consider this rate too high. I believe that such opinions will change when they perform the concrete computation of the republic budget. But this is not the chief point. Today the tax is divided only at the central and republican levels—22 and 23 percent. This same work must now be done within the Union republics. Numerous meetings with representatives of krays and oblasts at the congress attest that they do not yet know what awaits them.

The realization of the provisions enshrined in the fundamentals of land use, leaserelations, and others demands a lot of work.

This is not to mention such everyday questions as the organization of food supplies for the population and the entire consumer market, the development of sectors in the nonproduction sphere and their economic protection under market conditions, and the implementation of a new investment policy and the introduction of new methods for managing the construction complex, where, in my view, the situation is now being exacerbated to an extreme degree.

And two other very important points. First—about cadres. This is a very complex question for the immediate future. We have few people—at the center, in the republics, in the krays and oblasts—who are ready to work efficiently under conditions of a market economy. And it is our common urgent task to form this corps by expanding it constantly and intensively. I believe that the USSR Academy of Sciences, its economic branch, the Union republic academies of sciences, the Academy of the National Economy, and the country's leading higher educational institutions must tackle this task without delay. Of course, they will not be able to train everyone. But they must primarily retrain teacher cadres, working people of central economic departments of the Union and the republics, and the first groups of leaders in all sectors of the national economy. This is the priority task. And then the circle of people who have gotten to know the fundamentals of activity under market conditions will constantly expand.

And the second point. We must all work very actively to shape public opinion. It is perfectly clear that either a sober concept of the transition to a market, jointly elaborated by us and based on economic calculations and scientific research, will strengthen its positions here or the mass media and public opinion will be taken over by destructive forces with all the ensuing consequences for the country.

In conclusion I would like to emphasize yet again that without very active joint work by all the country's organs of legislative and executive power, without seeking and finding concerted approaches meeting common interests, we will not resolve the problem of making the transition to a market economy. In my opinion, the present situation in the country convincingly shows that we cannot waste time and effort on a confrontation.

Military

Baltic Commander Cited on Military Reform

PM2307145590 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 21 Jul 90 First Edition p 2

[Unattributed interview with Colonel General F. Kuzmin, commander of the Baltic Military District under the rubric "Express Poll"; place and date not given: "Three Questions for the Commander"]

[Text] [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] 1) What has already changed in the life and activity of the troops under your command as a result of the military reform?

[Kuzmin] I would like to note first of all that firm attitudes in favor of reform prevail among the district's troops. This makes it possible to successfully resolve tasks involved in the transformations that are already unfolding. Their essence is determined by the reorientation of troop training toward quality and by the specific nature of our border military district. The improvement of the table of organization structure is taking place within the framework of this process in parallel with a reduction in the size of troops and control organs. One motorized rifle division has been disbanded and the size of the staff and the directorates has been reduced by 15 percent.

The authority and influence of officers' meetings on the life of the units is growing, and NCO councils and other social formations are operating successfully. It is already clear that the democratization of Army life is an important means of increasing the sociopolitical and service activeness of servicemen.

The resolution of social and everyday questions, particularly the housing problem, has also been singled out as priorities.

A characteristic feature of the times is the development of glasnost and openness in the activity of the district's troops. Thousands of working people from the Baltic republics and representatives of social organizations and the mass media have visited our units and familiarized themselves with servicemen's lives, everyday conditions, and combat training this year alone.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] 2) In your opinion, what should be the ultimate aim of the Armed Forces reform?

[Kuzmin] I believe that the ultimate aim of military reform should be to achieve a new quality in our Armed Forces. They must be all-Union Armed Forces of the optimum size and structure geared to attaining high qualitative parameters in technical equipment and training. And staffed on a volunteer basis. Of course, a

switch to this principle of staffing is possible only if the necessary conditions are created and the relevant experience is accumulated.

At the same time, we must also create an efficient system for the training of mobilization resources. To my mind, it will be possible to introduce alternative service at some stage, but only after clear criteria for it have been defined. I think that it should be a variety of military service (without weapons) and that it should be intended to support the troops' activity and combat training.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] 3) What, in your opinion, are the main obstacles to the profound transformations in the Army and Navy required by the times?

[Kuzmin] In my opinion, the main obstacle is the lack of a harmonious state military policy. The legal basis of defense building and military service is substantially out of date and requires resolute renewal. We expect the USSR Law on Defense and other legal documents to be adopted as quickly as possible.

Active lawmaking on military questions in the Baltic republics, the growth of separatism, and the activation of anti-Army propaganda are seriously complicating the troops' activity and conditions for staffing and training the reserve and are creating an unhealthy moral and psychological atmosphere in military units. The need to increase the forces and resources allocated to guard important facilities in view of the increased complexity of the sociopolitical situation in the region has meant an excessive workload for personnel. All this also has an adverse effect on the progress of transformations. It is necessary to immediately resolve the question of the priority of Union legislation on defense questions throughout the whole country's territory.

Furthermore, I believe that we must note the destructive role of certain mass media, their desire for sensations, and their incompetence in examining military problems, which has a negative effect on the formation of public opinion and undermines the people's defense consciousness. Some politicians who start handing out advice about how to carry out perestroyka in the Army, forgetting that this sphere of human activity is as complex as any other socially useful labor and also brooks no dilettantism deserve the same reproach.

And finally, military-technical problems. We are not satisfied with the level of reliability of certain models of combat equipment and arms and the low level of standardization. We expect serious improvements in the supply of new communications systems and the faster introduction of automatic control systems.

Baltic Republics

Further Reportage on Preparations for Talks

LD2307203290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 23 Jul 90

[Text] The first meeting of the commission for political, legal, and diplomatic preparations for negotiations with the Soviet Union has taken place. In Lithuania's Supreme Soviet the decision was made to set up groups of specialists who will engage in drawing up the conditions for the negotiations. At issue, in particular, will be citizens' rights, the status of the USSR Armed Forces, the state border, political ties, and economic and other problems.

In the view of Lithuania's Prime Minister Kazimiera Prunskiene, negotiations with the USSR should be started immediately, as the situation is very favorable now. She stated this, speaking at the meeting of the Cabinet of Ministers and then on Lithunian television.

Lithuania Giving Priority to Talks With RSFSR

LD2007175590 Moscow TASS in English 1741 GMT 20 Jul 90

[By TASS correspondent Serafim Bykhun]

[Text] Vilnius July 20 TASS—The shorter the time before the summer vacations, the greater the load of problems facing Lithuanian leaders.

The last week showed that deputies could not resolve either issues of economic reform or how to find ways for raising living standards in the republic and their social guarantees.

The policy pursued by the government to privatise state property is thwarted by the unbalanced economy and the rickety finance and credit system.

But the main obstacle on this road is resistance of many Lithuanian citizens to private enterprise and their fears concerning social differentiation of society.

Lawmakers are facing a very acute question of selling and dividing land. There are four drafts of a land reform. But all of them need additional painstaking work.

Even many legislators do not agree that all land should be returned to those who owned it before 1940.

This week there was a noticeable trend in the parliamentary debate for open political confrontation with the Soviet leadership. Many politicial analysts were puzzled by a decision by the Lithuanian parliament to set up national military units.

This decision is in flagrant contradiction with a moratorium recently declared by the same parliament on the independence declaration of March 11. It interferes with preparations for talks with the USSR.

Many deputies (about 40) opposed a hasty adoption of the bill on conscription. They suggested that the bill should be discussed in public, since it was not clear where to take money for a Lithuanian army. Nevertheless, the bill was approved.

Many Lithuanian citizens were also concerned over parliament's hasty decision to begin talks with the Russian Federation.

Judging by speeches of many deputies and by the adopted document on "basic principles of concluding a treaty on relations and cooperation between the Lithuanian Republic and the Russian Federation", the talks with the Russian Federation are much more important for the Lithuanian parliament than talks with the Soviet leadership.

Submitting the document to parliament, Vytautas Landsbergis said: "When former union republics declare their sovereignty and rights one after another and begin disposing of everything directly, it may happen that the Russian Federation will be a more realistic subject of talks than the Soviet Union".

Dobychin Criticizes Lithuanian Leadership

PM2007141390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 Jul 90 Morning Edition p 2

[INTERFAX report: "In No Hurry for Dialogue"]

[Text] Vyacheslav Dobychin, a leader of the Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Citizens' Committee, has criticized the actions of the Lithuanian parliamentary leadership, which is in no hurry to start constructive dialogue with the USSR. In an interview with our correspondent he noted that the moratorium on the 11 March act of independence has still not come into force. In Dobychin's opinion, the personnel of the commission charged with the political, legal, and diplomatic preparation of the talks with the USSR is such that the actual talks could be in doubt. "Violation of civil rights continues" in Lithuania, he stressed. This is shown, Dobychin said, by the fact that a campaign to register people as Lithuanian citizens is being run simultaneously with a psychological campaign to intimidate those who want to retain their Soviet citizenship. He also reported that events in Lithuania to mark the 50th anniversary of Soviet power in the republic have been planned by the Citizens' Committee and a number of other organizations for 21st July. A rally will be held that day in Vilnius' Vingis Park.

Pro-CPSU Lithuanian Party Holds Plenum

LD2007195390 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 20 Jul 90

[Text] A plenum of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee on the CPSU platform was held today. It considered the main documents which will be submitted for discussion by the delegates of the Lithuanian Communist Party Congress. The plenum adopted a

resolution on the political assessment of the statement of the bureau of the reorganized Communist Party of Lithuania and the presidium of the republican Supreme Soviet in connection with the 50th anniversary of the restoration of Soviet power in Lithuania. The decision says in particular that in connection with this event the Central Committee Bureau of the reorganised Lithuanian Communist Party and the presidium of the republican Supreme Soviet have published the statement which grossly and cynically falsifies the historical events which took place in 1940. They fully reject the choice of Lithuanian residents and of the sejm constitutionally and democratically elected by the people to follow the path of socialist construction and of being a voluntary member of the USSR.

The Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee Plenum condemned this sort of statement. The communists call on all inhabitants of the republic to mark the 50th anniversary of the restoration of Soviet power in Lithuania and to consolidate all progressive forces in the struggle for the political and socioeconomic interests of the working people and for the further development of Lithuania within the community of sovereign states of the USSR.

Hears Report

LD2207110490 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1000 GMT 22 Jul 90

[Text] The session of the 21st congress of the Communist Party of Lithuania-CPSU, which opened yesterday, has continued in Vilnius today. Kuolyalis, secretary of the party's Central Committee, delivered a report. Speaking on the restoration of Soviet power in the republic 50 years ago, he said that no one anywhere will be able to erase these revolutionary events, which are sacred for communists, from the memory of the Lithuanian people. Even today they inspire us to oppose the plans of the republic's present leadership to take Lithuania back to the capitalist and pro-fascist society of the past.

The delegates to the congress also discussed issues relating to the results of the work of the 28th CPSU Congress, the program, and the rules of the Communist Party of Lithuania, the statute of the Central Control Commission, and a number of other matters.

This is already the third stage of the congress of Lithuanian communists who support the CPSU. Its fourth and final stage is planned for September.

Brazauskas Interviewed on Lithuania's Communists

AU2407111790 Warsaw TRYBUNA in Polish 18 Jul 90 p 2

[Interview with Algirdas Brazauskas, deputy premier of the government of the republic of Lithuania and first secretary of the independent Communist Party of Lithuania, by Marek Siwiec; place and date not given: "Starting Point"]

[Text] [Siwiec] Are you still a communist?

[Brazauskas] Yes.

[Siwiec] But the party that you lead surely is not?

[Brazauskas] Today, it is difficult to compare the utopian ideals of communism that we used to talk about at one time with present-day realities. My party has retained its name, but it has a new program and a new set of principles for its activities.

[Siwiec] How is it possible for a communist to head a party that is no longer communist?

[Brazauskas] A lot of things are possible today. There is a clear transformation of left-wing movements under way; one that encompasses all of Eastern Europe. All the movements are searching for new ideals, new goals, and new methods.

[Siwiec] How did you survive the moral pogrom directed against communism in Lithuania?

[Brazauskas] We have suffered a lot, and my party has sustained serious losses. However, we realized in good time that the most important thing is to be close to the people. Lithuania's independence was the supreme goal. That was our people's goal and that is why we left the CPSU.

[Siwiec] However, you still have a portrait of Gorbachev in your study?

[Brazauskas] I have often talked to him, and have done so here as well. The talks were at times unpleasant, especially when the Communist Party of Lithuania was in the process of redefining itself at the 20th congress. I recognize Mikhail Gorbachev's moral authority.

[Siwiec] How does your party operate in a state with a democratic system?

[Brazauskas] Like any other party. We are learning how to work as a parliamentary force, we take part in elections, and we are seeking to convince people of the validity of our arguments.

[Siwiec] Will your people possess enough fortitude to go over to working without privileges and to being subjected to frequent humiliations?

[Brazauskas] The leadership is made up of completely new people. They have not been corrupted by the old system. This is true at all levels. Many young people with very radical ideas have joined us. They set the tone today. Besides, a complete change of personnel was absolutely essential for our struggle to gain credibility. There are many Sajudis founder-members in the leadership of the Communist Party of Lithuania at various levels.

[Siwiec] Who supports you, and who can you count on in the elections?

[Brazauskas] There is probably no single social group that supports us. The Communist Party of Lithuania draws strong support from the intelligentsia, and we get our greatest number of votes in the countryside.

[Siwiec] What about the workers, the leading force until not that long ago?

[Brazauskas] They have not turned their back on the party, but they live under such difficult conditions that politics is not their main concern. Caring about the workers is one of our most important tasks; a task that we are addressing along with the trade unions.

[Siwiec] How would you describe the rest of the Lithuanian political landscape?

[Brazauskas] It is rather blurred, even the left part of it. There is the Communist Party of Lithuania that operates on the CPSU Platform. Its influence is marginal, and it is not known exactly how many members it has. A social democratic party has been formed. It has ten seats in parliament. Catholic organizations are very active. A liberal party was formed recently.

[Siwiec] What is Sajudis today?

[Brazauskas] It is not the Sajudis that it was a year ago. At that time it was a force that had perestroyka as its goal. We were all heading in that direction. Then Sajudis became politically differentiated. There is an increasingly clear division into parties, and in a sense Sajudis' role is diminishing as a result. A significant part of the left has come over to us.

[Siwiec] How are these division reflected in the Supreme Soviet?

[Brazauskas] There is the Sajudis club, and then there is the Center faction, which even includes a member of the Communist Party of Lithuania.

[Siwiec] How does your party operate?

[Brazauskas] We have not set up our own club. This provides more room for maneuver. We also do not employ any kind of administrative discipline regarding the way we vote. However, I am pleased to be able to say that on fundamental issues all members of the Communist Party of Lithuania who belong to the Supreme Soviet think along similar lines.

[Siwiec] Where is Lithuania on its march to independence?

[Brazauskas] We are on our starting blocks. The whole thing has not turned out to be that simple. There has been an economic blockade for 70 days now. We have suffered enormous economic losses. The talks that have commenced between the USSR and Lithuania are to define the way in which we can leave the USSR. The process might even take several years.

[Siwiec] People might start to get impatient. Independence is already beginning to be associated with rationing, gasoline shortages, and you are the government minister responsible for the economy. Have you any proposals to make regarding some kind of reform of the economy?

[Brazauskas] Our supply situation is the same as it is all over the country. To talk about some kind of vision of reform without independence is mistaken, but we are, nevertheless, involved in intensive work on such a program.

New Director of Lithuanian News Agency Named

LD2307171290 Vilnius Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 23 Jul 90

[Summary] C. Jursenas, spokesman for the government, announced that Rolandas Barysas, a young journalist, had been appointed director of the Lithuanian news agency ELTA.

Former Director Robertas Grikevicius was released from his post as a result of the reorganization of the agency.

Lenin Monument Defaced in Lithuania

LD2207141190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 22 Jul 90

[Text] Here is another report from Lithuania. The 50th anniversary of the restoration of Soviet power was marked yesterday in Varniai, a small town in the northwest of the republic in Telsiai Rayon, by a peculiar kind of exploit which was in fact a crude provocation. A monument to Lenin in the center of the town was barbarically defaced. Representatives of the local extremist public organisation, the Lithuanian Freedom League, claimed responsibility.

Interethnic Relations in Estonia Stabilize

LD2207152390 Moscow TASS in English 1516 GMT 22 Jul 90

[By ELTA correspondent Ruta Pels]

[Text] Tallinn July 22 TASS—The results of a public opinion poll, taken by the information journalistic centre from June 30 to July 4, show that interethnic relations in Estonia are stabilising. Twenty per cent of Estonians and ten per cent of non-Estonians even believe that they are improving, although many speakers assert the opposite at the meetings. Fifty five per cent of Estonians and 51 per cent of non-Estonians believe that the relations between the two ethnic groups remain unchanged, neither improving nor worsening.

Commenting on the results of the poll, Artur Kuznetsov, an Estonian minister in charge of interethnic problems, told ETA that there is no reason to say that Estonia is sliding down towards an interethnic conflict. The majority of people in both ethnic groups—57 per cent of Estonians and 55 per cent of representatives of other

nationalities—believe that the main cause of overall tension is economic difficulties. This shows that the time has come to realise the need for normal human relations.

The information centre polled 1,565 people in five cities and rural areas of the republic this month. It is planned to take two more such public opinion polls before the end of the year on the order of the government.

Poll on Nationality Issues in Estonia Reported

LD2407094290 Tallinn International Service in Estonian 2030 GMT 23 Jul 90

[Text] Eighty-five percent of ethnic Estonians and 34 percent of immigrant Russians support the idea of Estonia becoming fully independent. That was the result of a poll taken by the mass media information center at the beginning of July.

Compared with May, there is an eight-percent increase in non-Estonian support for the full restoration of Estonian independence. The poll also indicates an improvement in relations among nationalities living in Estonia; 58 percent of Estonians and 36 percent of non-Estonians regard relations among the nationalities in Estonia as stable. Compared to May, the number of Estonians seeing an improvement in relations among the nationalities in Estonia has gone up by 26 and the number of non-Estonians by 22 percent. This (?survey) contradicts the anxiety of some statesmen that nationality relations have deteriorated recently.

The poll also shows a marked decline in the popularity of the pro-Stalinist Intermovement and the United Council of Labor. In May, 29 percent of non-Estonians viewed the activities of the pro-Moscow, mostly Russian Intermovement as a source of major conflict. Currently, 45 percent of non-Estonians have come to share this opinion.

Estonian Party Veterans on Soviet Takeover

LD2407090490 Tallinn International Service in Estonian 2030 GMT 23 Jul 90

[Text] At a meeting in the Central Committee building in Tallinn last Friday, Estonian Communist Party veterans who took part in the events of 1940 that led to the illegal incorporation of Estonia into the Soviet Union stated that the Soviet takeover was a disastrous mistake.

The veterans read a statement saying that the events in Estonia that climaxed on 21 July 1940 were actually a follow-up to the tragedy that had begun in the Soviet Union several decades earlier. It was also pointed out that being totally responsible for what had happened in Estonia half a century ago, the Estonian Communist Party veterans fully support the current struggle for Estonia's independence.

Latvian Supreme Soviet Discusses KGB

LD2007183990

[Editorial Report] Riga Domestic Service in Latvian at 0917 GMT on 16 July carries a live relay of the Latvian Supreme Soviet session in Riga chaired by Gorbunovs.

Gorbunovs introduces the subject of the expulsion of Ivars Embrekts and, at a demand by deputies, on public order guards' formations, and invites deputy Talavs Jundzis, head of the commission, to report.

Talavs Jundzis begins by mentioning that the deputies have the draft resolutions "on the deputies' demands in connection with U.S. citizen I. Embrekts' expulsion from Latvia and on the legality of the activity of the establishments of the State Security Committee.

"It must be stated that the commission working once more on this draft law, which has been distributed to you, has accepted it, except that the commission's standpoint was to exclude the second item of the decision and, therewith, somewhat to define more exactly the third item of the decision, which would now become the second item, and it would read as follows:

"To charge the defense and internal affairs commission with the task of preparing proposals on the status of the State Security Committee, comma, of drawing up a concept of the State Security of the republic of Latvia and a relevant draft law."

After Gorbunovs' procedural question on voting, there are no questions, but Repse asks to speak in the debate.

Einars Repse says that he was one of those who proposed and supported the second item of this draft resolution "on a special commission of deputies for determining the status of the State Security Committee in the Republic of Latvia." He continues:

"First of all, why do we have to get a clear idea about the KGB status in Latvia? In the first place, because we today already ourselves have been confusing the titles on several occasions. What then really is the State Security Committee? Is it the State Security Committee of the republic of Latvia? Or, as it is being at times heard, is it the State Security Committee of the Latvian SSR? or, as it is at times heard, is it the USSR State Security Committee's branch in Latvia?

"On the one hand, as it were, formally we are the closest to that first one, namely to the republic of Latvia version, because by the law on the composition of the Council of Ministers we have included the KGB into the government.

"On the other hand, Mr. Johansons has not been confirmed the KGB chairman at the Supreme Soviet, nor does he himself especially wish it, and, last of all, as we see it from various practical matters, including the case of Ivars Embrekts, the KGB in Latvia in fact fulfills, moreover blindly and obediently, Moscow's instruction.

"Third, various questions connected with the State Security Committee archives and other matters exist. And, apart from that, fear of the KGB exists, in the sense, as it were, of the inevitability of its omnipotence, its existence everywhere.

"Of course, neither the Army units of the Baltic Military District located in Latvia nor the existing KGB structures can be changed in a day. But only because there are units of the USSR Armed Forces here and we cannot get rid of them, we are not calling them subunits of the Latvian Republic's Army. And no officer of the Armed Forces, after all, has been given the right to detain the recruits on the street or to arrive at 0700 at a private apartment in Riga in order to expel our guest and assistant beyond the territory of Latvia. Such authority we shall perhaps only permit to our Ministry of Internal Affairs, and also then according to the procedure laid down strictly by the law.

"So then, whether we allow it or not the State Security Committee, whose status is already very unclear, such additional extraordinary authority, which is characteristic only of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, will have to be specially decided on."

He goes on to ask why a special commission had to be formed, why the existing commission which takes care for the state's security conception and defense would not do. He says: "First of all, the question on the KGB is much wider than defense and internal affairs." He would like to believe that other commissions too would be interested, likewise every deputy. "Moreover, the question concerning the KGB is not only a professional one, it is also an ethical one.

"And, last of all, and to my mind most importantly, the question about the existing KGB and its status is not to be connected under any circumstances with the question of the state security concept of the republic of Latvia, because we shall still decide and debate whether we shall have our state security bodies, whether we shall entrust their authority fully to the Ministry of Internal Affairs. This would be the question in the competence of the commission for defense and internal affairs. But we shall never form, I hope, the security bodies of the state of Latvia by transforming the existing KGB. The KGB has during its period of activity five times changed its name, frequently also its leaders, but, nevertheless, throughout the century this bureau has remained the same."

Repse concludes: "an entirely different road has to be taken. And, as, by certain circumstances being realized, the KGB is capable of not only protecting, but even endangering the security of the republic of Latvia, I regard that this question is worthy of a special commission of deputies, and I would request establishment of such a commission. Thank you for your attention."

KGB Status in Latvia Under Review

PM2007141790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 19 Jul 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Report by correspondent Irina Litvinova: "Why a U.S. Citizen Was Deported"]

[Text] The Latvian Supreme Soviet has decided to set up a special commission to determine the status of the KGB in Latvia.

The catalyst for this action was the episode of the expulsion from the USSR of Ivar Embrekt, a U.S. citizen of Latvian extraction. The newspaper NOVOSTI RIGI stated ironically on this score: "It was only by traveling a long, hard road that the well-known Soviet intelligence agent Kim Philby was able to infiltrate Britain's SIS secret service and even reach its leadership, thereby displaying the acme of professionalism. But even he would probably have envied U.S. citizen Ivar Embrekt, who managed to infiltrate the Foreign Ministry in literally three weeks."

In fact, there was no need for "infiltration," since the political scientist, who had arrived at the invitation of the Latvian Enlightenment Society, was simply offered a job with the Foreign Ministry after a couple of weeks' vacation in Latvia. His salary of R350 a month was to have been paid by the External Relations Department of the Latvian People's Front.

Naturally, this was in violation of all the norms governing the presence of foreigners in the USSR. When the USSR Foreign Ministry became aware that, contrary to all regulations, a foreigner was "working" in a department which continued to receive secret documents from Moscow, he was informed through KGB staffers that his visa had been canceled. Incidentally, Embrekt made no complaint either in the USSR or later in an interview with the foreign mass media. He only asked that no representations be made through diplomatic channels. He was accommodated.

Complaints were made by deputies from the People's Front faction. Despite the obvious violations, they believed that an independent Latvia could invite whom it wished and give guests access to where they wished.

A commission set up by the Supreme Soviet should elaborate a concept for protecting the Latvian Republic's security.

Agreement Signed on Baltic Sea Protection

LD2307221490 Riga Domestic Service in Latvian 0430 GMT 2 Jul 90

[Text] In Tallinn, participants in a scientific conference have signed a treaty of cooperation on the ecological protection of the Baltic Sea. Delegations of the Academies of Sciences of the three Baltic republics and the Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences intend joint undertakings on the protection of the waters of the Baltic Sea.

Latvian, Lithuanian, and Estonian scientists have also signed an agreement according to which they will work out a unified policy of scientific research.

Anniversary of Soviet Baltic Rule Reported

LD2107135290

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 0800 GMT on 21 July broadcasts a 12-minute round-table discussion with historian Vladimir Vasilyevich Gurkin, Viktor Ivanovich Filatov, editor in chief of VOYENNO-ISTORICHESKIY ZHURNAL, and Olstankino radio commentator Galina Vinogradova, on the 50th anniversary of the restoration of Soviet rule in the Baltic republics.

Filatov points out that when Landsbergis, speaking in the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet, referred to the tragic events of June 1940, he could not have said anything else because of his origin; his father was a major landowner in Lithuania and had personal contact with Hitler. Judging from the archive documents which show the elections of the governments of the sejms of these states, Filatov says he doesn't have the slightest doubt as regards the Baltic states' support for the communists and for becoming part of the Soviet Union. Archive documents do not give any support for claims now being made that this happened at pistol-point.

Filatov then goes on to refer to the address in support of joining the USSR made by Paleckis, chairman of the plenipotentiary delegation of the Lithuanian People's Sejm, at the USSR Supreme Soviet session in August 1940, discussing how poor Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia were in 1939-40 as compared with other European states. Fascist regimes which were closely linked with Hitler were in power at the time. Hitler's plans for the Baltic republics was for genocide of the local population and for these territories to be cleared of the native population.

V.V. Gurkin then outlines the details of the master plan for the East, a comprehensive program for the colonization and harmonization of Eastern space drawn up on Hitler's personal instructions.

Drawing a parallel with Albanians occupying foreign embassies in Tirana, Filatov says that in 1940, something similar happened prior to the Baltic states joining the Soviet Union. Documents show peasants and workers from Estonia, Lithuania, and Latvia storming border obstructions to break through into our territory so as to enjoy the good life in the Soviet Union.

In 1938 there were some 70,000 jobless in Lithuania alone, Vinogradova notes, out of a population of about 1 million. In the 1919-39 period, some 100,000 citizens emigrated from Lithuania in search of a better life, she says.

Filatov observes that the likes of Landsbergis were of course better off during that period.

Gurkin makes the point that from the very start of the Hitlerite occupation of the Baltic, the bourgeois nationalists rendered the Nazis vigorous support. Altogether during the Hitlerite occupation of Lithuania 700,000 people were killed, and over 370,000 residents of Lithuania and some 100,000 citizens who were brought in from other republics of the USSR and occupied states of Europe were deported to Germany.

In this connection, Filatov says that a terrible hullaballoo is now being raised around how many Balts the communists deported to Siberia. KGB documents say precisely that some 500 Latvian families were exiled to West Siberia two weeks before World War II began. A Nazi document says in this respect that there was every reason to believe that if these 500 families which belonged to the "intelligentsia" had not been taken out of Latvia, they would have been subject to attacks by punitive Latvian detachments. Apart from that, 281 prostitutes and 543 criminal recidivists were deported, also mainly to Krasnoyarsk Kray.

Gurkin says that 334,000 Soviet soldiers lost their lives to liberate the peoples of the Baltic region.

In conclusion, Vinogradova recommends VOYENNO-ISTORICHESKIY ZHURNAL which has been printing very many materials on these events.

Baltics Observe Anniversary

LD2107161490 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 21 Jul 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The people of Lithuania are marking the 50th anniversary of the adoption by the republic's National Seimas of the declaration proclaiming Soviet power in different ways.

Today the Citizens' Committees of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Vilnius City Committee of the Communist Party of Lithuania (CPSU), the Committee of War and Labor Veterans, and a number of other public organizations and movements invited the people of the Lithuanian capital to Vingis Park to celebrate. Festive rallies were held in Klaipeda and a number of other towns and rayons.

However, many Vilnius buildings today sported state flags decked with ribbons of mourning. The Presidium of the Lithuanian Supreme Council has published a statement in which 21 July is described as a day of insult, shame and misfortune.

Today, the 50th anniversary of the restoration of Soviet power in Latvia, reports TASS, a number of republican newspapers print a report from the presidium of the republic's Supreme Council. This says in part that the National Seimas set up 50 years ago took the decision to declare Soviet power and asked the USSR Supreme Soviet to accept Latvia into the Soviet Union. This means the destruction of the independent Latvian

Republic. The Latvian Supreme Council has declared the Seimas declaration of 21 July 1940 on Latvia's entry into the USSR as invalid from the moment it was adopted.

Pro-CPSU Communists Celebrate

LD2107204290 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 21 Jul 90

[By correspondents A. Paulyus and S. Gelbakh; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The civic committee and the city committee of the Lithuanian Communist Party-CPSU yesterday called on the people of Vilnius to come to the festivities marking the 50th anniversary of the restoration of Soviet power in Lithuania. The (Pyulcheskoye Polye) was designated as the venue of the meeting. The working people of Lithuania and the democratically elected people's Sejm passed a historic decision on 21 July 1940—one that determined LIthuania's destiny for five decades. Addressing those assembled is Valentina Slazutka, first secretary of the Vilnius Gorkom [city party committee] of the Lithuanian Communist Party-CPSU. A message from the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium to the peoples of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia was read out at the meeting. The speeches by Mikolas Burokevicius, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee, by those who had taken part in the events of the summer of 1940, and by guests were received warmly. Festivities began after the meeting in the same venue: the Mingiz Park. [as heard]

The third stage of the 21st congress of the Lithuanian Communist Party CPSU took place in Vilnius today. The delegates, representing some 40,000 communists, discussed the results of the CPSU's 28th congress and the tasks of the Lithuanian Communist Party. Discussion of the draft program and of the draft statute of the Lithuanian Communist Party began at the congress. It was decided to have the discussion continued in party organizations in order to decide the issue of adopting these documents during the fourth stage of the congress, in mid-September. [video shows rally; speaker; posters reading "We are for unity of the CPSU," "Down with Sajudis' monopoly"; folk dancing; congress auditorium and audience]

Rubiks Speaks at Anniversary Meeting

LD2007210290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 20 Jul 90

[Text] Tomorrow it will be the 50th anniversary of the restoration of Soviet power in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. A ceremonial meeting in Riga was devoted to this date today. Veterans of the party, participants in the revolutionary movement and the Great Patriotic War, representatives of labor collectives and party aktivs gathered at it. Rubiks, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee, made a report. The participants in the meeting adopted a resolution in which they approved the decisions of the 28th CPSU Congress and appealed to communists and all supporters of the socialist idea to join together in a united front to struggle for the renewal of society.

Commentary on Anniversary

LD2107140790 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 21 Jul 90

[Commentary by Vladimir Bezyayev, anchorman of "Saturday News" and Mayak's "Music Panorama"]

[Text] It is 50 years ago today that Soviet rule was restored in the Baltic republics. But the inhabitants are not all marking this anniversary in the same spirit. Thus, today in Latvia, a number of republican newspapers published a report of the presidium of the republic's Supreme Soviet. It says in particular that the 21 July 1940 declaration of the Sejm on Latvia becoming part of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has been invalid from the time it was adopted. As noted in the report, the presidium of the Latvian Supreme Soviet regards the celebration of this humiliating, tragic anniversary as being profoundly insulting to its people and all inhabitants of the republic.

Well, various things can be said about this, but you can't take the words out of the song, this is our history, whether we want it or not.

Comparison—Supreme Soviet Appeal to Baltics

PM2007152590

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 21 July 1990 carries in its First Edition on page 1 the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium appeal "To the Peoples of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia." Comparison of the PRAVDA item with the translation of the Moscow Domestic Russian version published in the 20 July 1990 Soviet Union DAILY REPORT beginning on page 89, reveals the following variations:

Page 89, column two, second paragraph, sentence one, PRAVDA reads: ...to join the USSR. Peoples which... (omitting "Union of the");

Page 90, column one, second paragraph, single sentence, PRAVDA reads: ...the advantages of integration, and the stability of security.

These aims... (rewording);

Page 90, column one, third paragraph, sentence two, PRAVDA reads... perestroyka is not only a landmark from... (adding "only");

Page 90, column one, fifth paragraph, last sentence, PRAVDA reads: ...new Union treaty.
[Signed] The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. (adding signatory).

RSFSR

Yeltsin Interviewed on CPSU, Gorbachev

AU2307130790 Vienna KURIER in German 23 Jul 90 p 5

[Second part of "exclusive" interview with RSFSR Chairman Boris Yeltsin by Werner Kraeutler and Alexander Cheparukhin during a recent 10-hour ride from Moscow to Riga: "I Want Cooperation With Gorbachev"]

[Text] [KURIER] If one looks at the spectrum of political parties in the West, which Western parties are closest to you?

[Yeltsin] I used to say that I would prefer the social democrats. However, the social democratic parties are different in different countries. As far as my political orientation is concerned, I prefer not to be a member of any party and not to participate in the political work of any party. I would like to enjoy the confidence of all parties and organizations. I have to represent all the people, both party members and people who are not affiliated with a certain party.

[KURIER] Why did you resign from the CPSU?

[Yeltsin] First of all, we are striving for a multiparty system in Russia. Thus, it is not possible for a single party to defend its monopoly position. It is not compatible with my views to remain a member of such a party. Of course, the 28th CPSU Congress made it easier for me to leave the party. I repeatedly told the congress of my determination to resign from the party unless radical reforms were tackled.

If the mass media is now noisily selling the results of the congress as a victory of the reformers over the conservatives, this is simply not true. The less conservative defeated the ultra conservatives. Thus, the conservatives were the winners. I would like to point out that the CPSU is a party dominated by the apparatus.

[KURIER] You recently accepted an invitation from Austria's Vice Chancellor Riegler to visit Austria. How do you assess Austria?

[Yeltsin] Russia is now making its first direct contacts with foreign states, primarily with Europe, Japan, and the United States. In my view, Austria has always played the role of a catalyst. It is a venue both for European policies and world politics.

I view Austria as a really neutral country. It has for decades been both a focal point and a neutral constant. For me Austria is a very reliable partner, and a guarantor of the safe and free development of any kind of cooperation.

[KURIER] You promised free elections in Russia within one year.

[Yeltsin] The exact date will be set by the deputies' congress of the Russian Republic. It will not be my decision. I suggested one year because we want to prepare the elections more carefully than the election of the president of the Soviet Union. A new Constitution must also be adopted. Later, really free, direct and secret elections must be prepared in all Soviet republics. We might hold elections in May or June 1991.

[KURIER] As the chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Republic, you must also cooperate with people who denounced you as recently as one year ago.

[Yeltsin] Yes. The last two or three years were the toughest years of my life. I even became sick. When I joined the Communist Party 30 years ago, I really believed in the communist ideals.

During the two years I was a member of the CPSU Politburo, the Soviet Union's highest leading body, I discovered that numerous members of the Politburo were by no means the much-praised "best representatives of the party," and that they did not really represent the people.

At the plenary session in October I delivered a speech in which I mentioned the looming problems. Everything that I warned the party of has meanwhile become reality. I stressed at the time that I considered the tactics designed to implement perestroyka to be faulty and that Gorbachev's personal and human qualities were not necessarily optimal. He tends to accumulate personal power, and he even loves it so much that it might turn into a cult.

What people would not have dared to think about three years ago has now become a reality: Such criticism has become possible now.

In retrospect, it was absolutely right to openly discuss things in public and to give the people the feeling that they can express criticism in public. It was important to show people that Gorbachev is not the wise father as he is presented in the media.

[KURIER] What is your personal relationship with Gorbachev like?

[Yeltsin] Gorbachev was the one who headed the campaign against me. He used Ligachev (leader of the dogmatists—the editors) in this connection. As far as cooperation with Gorbachev is concerned, I present the standpoint of the Russians, not my own standpoint, when holding talks with him. This is necessary.

I am convinced that we will never have personal or even private contact in the future. This is impossible. However, dialogue and even cooperation between us is necessary in the present situation.

[KURIER] Have you talked with Gorbachev after your resignation from the CPSU?

[Yeltsin] Yes, of course. He just called me on the telephone. I was determined not to be the first one to call, knowing that my step in the congress was a very far-reaching political act. It must have been a severe blow for Gorbachev. The party has been weakened by my resignation.

Numerous attempts were made to stop me, at last year's election to the People's Congress, for example. However, 90 percent of the Muscovites voted for me.

Then there were attempts to prevent my election as a Russian deputy. This turned out to be another defeat for my opponents.

Finally, there were attempts to prevent my election as president of the Supreme Soviet of Russia. Gorbachev was most active here. He led the "operation to stop Yeltsin." A small anecdote shows how he proceeded. On the eve of his departure for the summit with Bush, he gathered 250 loyal communist deputies of the Russian Assembly of Deputies, instructing them "to stop Yeltsin with all possible means." I wonder what this means, with all possible means. What can this be, maybe a blow on the head?

Russian Supreme Soviet Issues Resolutions

Government Membership Ratified

PM2007110790 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 19 Jul 90 Second Edition p 1

[RSFSR Supreme Soviet resolution "On Ratifying the Composition of the RSFSR Council of Ministers"]

[Text] The RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet resolves:

To ratify the following RSFSR Council of Ministers:

Gennadiy Vasilyevich Kulik, first deputy chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers and minister of agriculture and food;

Gennadiy Innokentyevich Filshin, deputy chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the RSFSR State Committee for the Economy;

Grigoriy Alekseyevich Yavlinskiy, deputy chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the State Commission for Economic Reform;

Nikolay Grigoryevich Malyshev, deputy chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the RSFSR State Committee for Science and Higher Education Affairs;

Igor Trifonovich Gavrilov, deputy chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the RSFSR State Committee for Ecology and Nature Use;

Viktor Nikolayevich Yaroshenko, RSFSR minister of foreign economic ties;

Eduard Dmitriyevich Dneprov, RSFSR minister of education;

Mikhail Nikiforovich Poltoranin, RSFSR minister of the press and mass media;

Viktor Ivanovich Kisin, RSFSR minister of industry;

Vladimir Borisovich Bulgak, RSFSR minister of communications, information technology, and space;

Boris Grigoryevich Fedorov, RSFSR minister of finance;

Nikolay Vasilyevich Fedorov, minister of justice,

Dmitriy Leonidovich Fedorov, chairman of the RSFSR State Committee for Geology and the Utilization of Fuel and Energy and Mineral Raw Material Resources;

Vladimir Kondratyevich Vozhagov, chairman of the RSFSR State Committee for Material and Technical Supply for Republic and Regional Programs;

Aleksandr Nikolayevich Streligov, RSFSR Council of Ministers administrator of affairs.

In accordance with Article 123 of the RSFSR Constitution the chairmen of the councils of ministers of the autonomous republics are ex-officio members of the RSFSR Council of Ministers.

[Signed] B.N. Yeltsin, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet.
[Dated] Moscow, RSFSR House of the Soviets, 14 July 1990.

Media Resolution

PM2007114790 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 19 Jul 90 Second Edition p 1

[RSFSR Supreme Soviet resolution "On RSFSR State Television and Radio"]

[Text] In accordance with the resolution of the First Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies "On RSFSR Mass Media," the RSFSR Supreme Soviet resolves:

1. That the RSFSR State Television and Radio be established.

2. That the RSFSR Council of Ministers and the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Committee for the Mass Media, Ties with Public Organizations and Citizens' Mass Movements, and the Study of Public Opinion resolve before 15 September 1990 the question of the right to ownership of the material and technical base of RSFSR State Television and Radio (on the basis of Central Television's Channel Two, a separate radio channel, and the communications systems of the USSR Ministry of Communications).

3. That the RSFSR Ministry of Finance and the RSFSR Gosbank [State Bank] prepare documents on questions of financial and credit-accounting relations with the

USSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting (on a contract basis).

4. That the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Committee for the Mass Media, Ties with Public Organizations and Citizens' Mass Movements, and the Study of Public Opinion and the RSFSR minister of the press and mass media be responsible for monitoring the execution of the present resolution.

[Signed] B.N. Yeltsin, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet.
[Dated] Moscow, RSFSR House of the Soviets, 13 July 1990.

Official Privileges

PM2007144590 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 20 Jul 90 Second Edition p 1

[RSFSR Supreme Soviet resolution: "On Privileges in the RSFSR"]

[Text] Guided by the decisions of the First Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies on the need to deepen democratic transformations in the RSFSR,

and on the basis of the impermissibility of any privileges for individual officials (or groups of individuals) whatever post they hold, or for individual organizations and their workers, rejecting all kinds and forms of privileges of:

power;
unearned income;
undeserved privileges;
undeserved and unearned comfortable living and working conditions for leading workers with organizations, enterprises, and institutions, and state organ apparatus staffers, in the belief that privileges violate social justice, the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium **resolves** that:

1. All types and forms of official privilege in the RSFSR shall be abolished, in which regard acts of legislation, resolutions, nstructions, or orders directly or indirectly guaranteeing official privileges shall be considered null and void as of 1 August 1990.

2. As of 1 August 1990 the specific working conditions and types of services (their character) enjoyed by senior officials shall be laid down by soviets of people's deputies and published in the mass media without fail within 10 days.

3. The RSFSR Supreme Soviet Glasnost Committee shall monitor the fulfillment of this resolution.

[Signed] B.N. Yeltsin, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet
[Dated] 17 July 1990.

Federal Treaty

PM2007160190 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 20 Jul 90 Second Edition p 1

[RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium resolution "On a Federal Treaty"]

[Text] Carrying out the decisions of the First Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies and recognizing the need to profoundly transform the entire federation, the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium resolves that:

1. A Soviet of the Federation with 63 members, including the chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, the chairmen of autonomous republic supreme soviets, the chairmen of autonomous oblast and okrug [national district] soviets, and 31 representatives determined by the chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet from krays, oblasts, and cities under republic jurisdiction shall be set up to coordinate work to conclude a federal treaty.

2. It be recommended that the federal treaty include a declaration on the basic principles of the RSFSR's federal structure; treaties between federation entities and the RSFSR, as well as bilateral and multilateral treaties among federation entities; and treaties on the restoration, transformation, and creation of various forms of national and regional formations.

3. The following main phases of the treaty process be envisaged:

the formation of a Soviet of the Federation;

the elaboration and coordination of the basic principles of the RSFSR's federal structure;

the discussion at the next Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies of the declaration on the basic principles of the RSFSR's federal structure;

the conclusion of the treaties referred to in Article 3 of this resolution;

the compilation of the federal treaty's text and its signing;

and the bringing of RSFSR Federation entities' normative and legal acts into line with the adopted federal treaty.

[Signed] B.N. Yeltsin, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet
[Dated] 17 July 1990

Foreign Economic Ties

PM2307092190 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 20 Jul 90 Second Edition p 1

[RSFSR Supreme Soviet resolution "On the Basic Principles for Implementing Foreign Economic Activity on RSFSR Territory"]

[Text] The determining aim of the foreign economic activity of the RSFSR at the present-day stage is to resolve the tasks of radical economic reform. In order to achieve this end the republic's foreign economic activity is geared toward actively including the national economy in the system of the international division of labor, including by means of ensuring ruble convertibility as soon as possible. In organizing and implementing its foreign economic activity the RSFSR is guided by generally accepted international principles and regulations.

In accordance with the declaration on the RSFSR's state sovereignty and the resolution of the First Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies "On Delimiting the Functions of the Administration of Organizations on RSFSR Territory (the Basis of a New Union Treaty)" the RSFSR Supreme Soviet resolves:

1. To establish that all legal persons and individual citizens, irrespective of the form of ownership, operating on RSFSR territory in accordance with its laws are entitled to participate in foreign economic activity and to have direct access to the external market.

2. The RSFSR encourages foreign investment and, within the framework of republic legislation, guarantees its protection, including through the creation of free economic zones and the safeguarding of the stability of contractual relations. Foreign investors—both legal and physical persons—enjoy equal rights with RSFSR legal persons on RSFSR territory.

3. Tax payments accruing to republic and local budgets from exports of goods and services in the RSFSR take place at stable rates. Any profit remaining is fully at the disposal of enterprises.

4. To envisage the creation in the RSFSR of state organizations guaranteeing export credits.

5. The coordination of foreign economic activity within the RSFSR, and the implementation of foreign economic policy—including policy as regards attracting foreign investment into the republic's national economy—is the responsibility of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and Council of Ministers.

6. To instruct the RSFSR Council of Ministers together with the RSFSR Gosbank [State Bank] to elaborate a system of measures ensuring the protection of the RSFSR's foreign-currency interests.

7. To instruct the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Committee for International Affairs and Foreign Economic Ties and the Committee on Economic Reform and Ownership to draw up, together with the RSFSR Council of Ministers, drafts of the corresponding legislative acts stemming from this resolution.

[Signed] B.N. Yeltsin, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet
[Dated] Moscow, RSFSR House of the Soviets. 14 July 1990

Union Demands on North Russia Questioned

PM2307140990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 Jul 90 Morning Edition p 1

[Article by Aleksandr Protsenko under the "Political Diary" rubric: "Dialogue From a Position of Strength"]

[Text] It seems that the political upheavals in the country have not come to an end with the end of the miners' political strike. On Saturday and Sunday, 14 and 15 July, rallies and demonstrations are to be held throughout the north of the country from Murmansk to Sakhalin and will put forward demands, addressed now to the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] government. Demands are for urgent measures to improve the socioeconomic situation of the people living in northern areas. On Monday the Federation of Independent Russian Trade Unions [FIRTU] will officially hand these demands to the government of the republic.

The preamble will state that the long years of intensive and ruthless exploitation of the raw material resources of the north have brought whole regions to the brink of ecological catastrophe, the social development of the northern territories and the material situation of the local working people do not match their contribution to the country's economy, and the per capita consumption of meat, fruit, and vegetables in the north is substantially below scientifically set standards...

The conclusion is: "If Russia and the country need the northerners' labor and the goods which they produce, then the latter have a right to expect from the organs of power attention to and concrete and prompt consideration of their needs and their effective solution."

In practical terms this means that unless the RSFSR Council of Ministers examines the demands within two weeks and specifies when they will be fulfilled, the FIRTU will, to begin with, organize a two-hour warning strike throughout the north.

To put it bluntly, the rallies and demonstrations will take place prior to the presentation of the package of demands to the government precisely to illustrate that the independent trade unions mean business.

As a man who knows the region beyond the Polar Circle not just from hearsay (having spent more than 10 years in the Taymyr), I should be glad for the friends whom I left behind there and grateful to the Russian trade unions for having at long last decided to uphold the interests of the northerners. And uphold them, as they say, "regardless"...

But what do we see if we look more closely?

It is difficult to find an oblast or a kray today where the natural resources have not been barbarically exploited by our administrative-edict system, to find a region which is not threatened with an ecological catastrophe. I know of no region where people are satisfied with the social development of their territory or their wages. As for

meat, vegetables, and fruit, I will refrain from mentioning them altogether. Where have the scientifically substantiated standards gone?

And why has the FIRTU decided to help first of all precisely the northerners, rather than, say, the inhabitants of the steppes, or the people in the Far East?

The answer is simple: It just happened this way. To begin with, an action group sprang up in Murmansk which worked out how much the state had failed to deliver to the inhabitants of Murmansk in recent decades. Then people in other regions picked up this interesting initiative. And only during the final stage did the FIRTU join in by organizing in the selfsame Murmansk a trade union conference on the socioeconomic problems of the north with the participation of other territories right up to Sakhalin. The conference materials are now being used to hold the first "summer trade union offensive" in our country, or "joint action days"—the form of collaboration with the government chosen by the federation.

It cannot be ruled out that a year from now southerners rather than northerners will take part in this kind of "offensive." Or the inhabitants of small cities where there are no opera theaters and where sausage is in short supply. Or the inhabitants of large cities where such theaters do exist and the sausage supply situation is not quite so bad, but where there is a lot of noise and pollution. From small acorns... And according to the trade unions' demands, it is the government which must adopt measures.

It is easy nowadays to gain the reputation of a champion of the people. Five years ago no trade union organ would have dreamed of demanding something for the people from the powers that be. At best a respectful request was dispatched to the "top." Now no one requests anything any more, they demand! And that regardless of the fact that the government has only just been formed, that it has been appointed by a democratically elected parliament, and that it is no less interested in improving the socioeconomic position of the republic's population than the trade union leaders.

The problem is not just the untimeliness of the demands or their categorical nature... It is important to take a look at what the champions of the working people are demanding.

The list is not long, and it is relatively modest. They demand increased wages—or rather increased allowances for living in the north: They want the regional coefficient to be raised to the maximum level in all the regions, restrictions on the payment of northern allowances to be removed, the allowances to be paid in full to young people who have grown up in the north, and so forth.

Improved supplies—guaranteed deliveries of food, consumer goods, construction materials, and machinery via the state order.

Care to be taken of those who depart from the north—pensioners to be given an extra allowance to top up their pension, a legislatively guaranteed right for northerners to be given priority in the acquisition of accommodation in the central zone and the allocation to them of plots of land for individual construction...

Not very much, it would seem. But the point is that these demands can only be fulfilled by strengthening the administrative-edict system. Meanwhile the perestroyka of our economy should consist of all these questions being entrusted to the market, a self-regulating system under which those who work better and achieve higher results live better. But...

"The state has never accepted responsibility for creating normal conditions for the people who live in the north, V. Romanov, deputy chairman of the FIRTU, believes. "Now it must accept a substantial part of this expenditure."

This is an interesting thought, of course, and it fully accords with the sentiments which were inculcated in our country for many decades: The state is responsible for us all, it will provide us with food and drink, with housing, and with shoes and clothes. It seems that it will take a long time before we rid ourselves of the serious affliction of expecting all good things—and, incidentally, also all bad things—to emanate from the state. Here perestroyka has so far changed nothing. To begin with people expected and demanded from Gorbachev and Ryzhkov, now the inhabitants of Russia are expecting and demanding from Yeltsin and Silayev, and the inhabitants of other regions from their leaders.

But miracles do not happen. The country has to be fed by the peasants and clothed and shod by the workers. Everyone's living standard must be the result of the quantity and quality of the results of everyone's labor rather than anyone's concern or favors. Governments merely can and must determine the priorities of the development of specific sectors or regions, stimulating, by means of tax breaks and subsidies, the influx of people and capital. The development of the Russian north may and probably will become a priority. However, any preferential treatment or the size of subsidies cannot be decided by anyone's desires or demands but merely by economic expediency and the interests of the development of our entire national economy.

Such a program is currently being elaborated by the government of the Russian Federation. It will be responsible for how we all live—in the north, south, west, and east.

Incidentally, in Romania the new government which has come to power has asked the trade union to declare a six-month moratorium on strikes and similar actions of a political or economic nature. Does our country and each of its constituent republics need civic consensus any less than that?

Conference Views Mechanics of Local Power

PM1907085590 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 18 Jul 90 Second Edition p 2

[Report by TASS parliamentary correspondent I. Novikov: "How the Local Soviets Should Work"]

[Text] You can accuse the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet of anything you like, but not of lacking dynamism and drive. On 17 July, 100 days after the elections, an all-Union conference of representatives of rayon, city, settlement, and rural soviets was convened in Moscow by the republic parliament. The idea is clear: They already have some experience, and it is useful to exchange that experience in the largest forum of the people's power. Another thing is of no less importance—the view ahead. After all, as B.N. Yeltsin stated when opening the meeting, draft laws of primary importance, including draft laws on the local soviets, local self-management, and the local economy, await adoption.

A businesslike discussion ensued. At issue was not just the activity of those who execute state policy directly in the heart of the masses, although it is impossible not to mention the "little parliament" atmosphere in the hall: There was a crossfire of speeches from the rostrum and the floor. The main point is that the leaders of the soviets submitted their ideas and reflections for collective discussion at a time when the party has virtually handed over power to them, but they have not yet actually taken up that power. And there is another circumstance—the need to clarify by combined efforts questions of the structure of the local organs of power and administration, the delimitation of their functions, and the forms and methods of work in conditions of radical transformations.

Perestroyka sets the tempo for the work of the local soviets and requires new approaches to problems. This was mentioned by those who spoke. Let us consider the facts and figures which they cited. In Russia the deputies' corps in the local soviets has been 70 percent renewed, and many new people have taken up the duties of grassroots level soviet leaders and soviet ispolkom [executive committee] leaders. How are they to master the knowhow and skills of soviet work? After all, this work must in many ways be different from what it was yesterday, or even what it is today. For example, a point of interest is how the work of the new organs of the soviets—the soviet presidiums—is to be structured. How are the soviet chairman and the soviet ispolkom chairman to collaborate? What is new in the organizational work of the soviets and of their standing committees and people's deputies; how are their relations with the executive and administrative organs formed; what difficulties arise here, and how are they resolved? The discussion revealed a far from uniform approach and a wide scattering of opinions, but on one thing the speakers were unanimous: Sloth and shillyshallying are impermissible. Effective measures are needed, since when the machinery of genuine people's power begins operating at full power depends on the gestation period of the new soviets. One speaker noted: "We have a lot of soviet power, but so far it is helpless."

A powerful executive authority is needed at local level, but how is it to be secured? The speakers concurred in the opinion that it should not be sought in the fragments of the old totalitarian structures or, of course, through the combination of more than one office. It was noterd that, under a certain Russian Federation law, chairmen of local soviets must determine as soon as possible what to choose—party, economic, or state posts. And, of course, such leaders are today in a majority in the republic.

But, the speakers stressed, the main brake on perestroyka processes in the grassroot soviets is not this. Power in the localities must be handed over, not in words but in deeds, to the deputies. Then the issue which more than one soviet chairman talked about at the conference will decide itself: What proportion of power should they give to the top state organs.

Russians Leaving To Live in Lithuania

PM1907131490 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 19 Jul 90 p 1

[Article by V. Gavrichkin under the rubric "Topical!": "Russians Go to Lithuania"]

[Text] Russians are going to Lithuania. They are leaving one by one and in whole families. They exchange apartments, they go on a job invitation, and simply on the off chance of finding employment. It is easy to understand Lithuanians returning to their native land. But how do you explain the fact that Russians wanting to leave for Lithuania turn up every day on the quiet Pisemskiy Street in Moscow, where the republic's permanent mission is located? What makes them give up good apartments and a familiar job and come into conflict with their friends and relatives and come to an unknown country where no one is expecting them, where they know no one and nothing, and where they do not even understand that melodic language.

The words have an unfamiliar ring—emigres, new citizenship, brain drain. These things are usually spoken of when people leave for abroad, for the West. But Lithuania is not distant America, "where I will never go." It has always been somewhere close at hand, nearby, familiar. And all at once, in just a few months, it has turned into a target of emigration, if we may use that term. It could hardly have been expected that the declaration of independence, the growth of anti-imperial sentiments, the economic blockade, and the anti-Lithuanian propaganda campaign would lead to such a bizarre result: more and more people wanting to live there.

Their decisions are based on various factors. Some are worried about their children's future, about ecology, while others want to implement ideas that are not

accepted in Russia. Some hope to find a new motherland in Lithuania, others intend to go further, to the West. All those I met are people with higher education, often with an unusual and difficult history, and the majority know foreign languages but do not know Lithuanian. Young people are rare exceptions. Nearly all have the wisdom of experience and are middle-aged or even elderly. With advancing years, people are usually inclined to a certain degree of conservatism, prefer stability, and do not like drastic changes of circumstances. "It is a tragedy, a personal tragedy, when a person decides to leave his native land, his familiar apartment, his circle of friends, and go to a strange land," Birute Nanartavichyute, through whose office at the Lithuanian permanent mission nearly all those leaving for the republic pass, says. "We try to help them. We look for jobs and help them find an apartment to exchange. The permanent mission runs Lithuanian language courses. Of course, there are complications. Paradoxically enough, after the declaration of the economic blockade the number wanting to go and live in Lithuania increased."

Why do they leave? They are Russians. Going to Lithuania?! Yevgeniy Grigoryevich Suvorov, age 40, by education a translator, recently employed as an electric fitter, whose wife, now his ex-wife, works at the party gorkom [city committee]: "The state of affairs in the country, and even in Moscow, is not to my liking. Chiefly, people's attitude to the changes. We still talk a lot, but do nothing. It is time to start work. The Lithuanians clearly want to build a new life, and I want to take part in building something new, something real."

Yelena Nikolayevna Andreyeva, chairman of the "Zimniy Sad" club, often has articles published, delivers lectures, knows English and French: "I am in a disastrous situation. My entire life's work—the year-round cultivation of vegetables and fruit, and with a high yield—is going to ruin. The dacha plot where I was engaged in research has been taken away from me, and no one is interested in my work. Let us open our eyes: There is no perestroyka. The country is in a terrible position, yet everyone spits on it. I no longer have any hope. Perhaps in Lithuania something will work out. The fact that they do not have a very good attitude to the Russians does not worry me—I am well disposed to people."

Different people, different lives. But among all the factors motivating them to leave their familiar nest and even break off relations with relatives, the chief factor that invariably emerged was dissatisfaction with the course of perestroyka. And they are leaving. Leaving for a republic—or perhaps we should say a country—where the people have firmly resolved to put an end to the totalitarian past.

Ordzhonikidze To Revert to Name of Vladikavkaz

LD2107121290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 21 Jul 90

[Text] The session of the Supreme Soviet of the North Ossetian Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic, which ended today, has adopted a decision on restoring the former name of the capital of the autonomous republic. Henceforth the town will be called not Ordzhonikidze, but Vladikavkaz. Such a decision has been adopted in connection with the fact that 82 percent of the inhabitants in the autonomous republic spoke out in favor of returning to the town its historic name.

Perm Farmers Threaten To Suspend Food Deliveries

PM2107154790 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 22 Jul 90 p 1

[I. Zakirov report "Conflict: Ultimatum in Response to an Ultimatum"]

[Text] If by 20 July Perm Oblast industrial centers have not supplied the countryside with manpower and machinery to help with the harvest, kolkhozes [collective farms] and sovkhozes [state farms] will suspend deliveries of milk, meat, and vegetables to the cities.

This hardline decision was adopted at a joint session of the presidium of the oblast kolkhoz council and the oblast agro-industrial committee council.

Meanwhile the inhabitants of many cities in the Kama River region are already on starvation rations. The oblast newspaper ZVEZDA has only just published an appeal to people's deputies from women workers at the Kungura machine-building plant in which they state that in Kungura one coupon per month can be exchanged for 500 grams of vermicelli, 300 grams of sausage, and 200 grams of butter. Milk, sour cream, curd cheese, and other food products are also in short supply. The women workers warn that unless food supplies improve in the near future, they will take their children to the main square and stage a hunger strike.

This tense social situation makes it all the more necessary for representatives of the cities and the countryside to sit down at the negotiating table without delay and do everything necessary to ensure that the harvest that has been grown is gathered.

Fire Shuts Down Smolensk Nuclear Power Station

PM2307153990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Jul 90 Morning Edition p 6

[Report by B. Antonov, chief of the Main Administration for the Operation of Nuclear Power Stations: "Fire at Nuclear Power Station"]

[Text] A cable leading to the reserve startup boiler caught fire at the Smolensk nuclear power station on 22 July 1990. The fire was put out by firefighters and station personnel. The second unit was automatically stopped and the reactor was automatically shut down. There are no irregularities in the operation of the systems ensuring reactor safety. By order of the ministry a commission has been set up to investigate the causes.

Severe Flood Follows Heavy Rain in Siberia

LD2407072390 Moscow TASS in English 0655 GMT 24 Jul 90

[Text] Moscow July 24 TASS—Heavy rainfall west of Lake Baikal in Siberia caused severe floods, resulting in deaths and 400 million roubles worth of material damage, the newspaper SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA reported today.

Thousands of people were left homeless and over 400 bridges were swept away when rivers overflowed their banks, it said.

A regional task force is overseeing the joint efforts of local governing councils, party organisations, the civil defence service and army units to deal with the emergency.

The leadership of the Russian parliament has also taken relief measures, and the government is preparing a decision to give the stricken areas early financial, material and food aid, SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA said.

It warned about the danger of recurring floods next month. When weathermen predict more heavy rains. The situation is aggravated by the fact that thoughtless, large-scale wood felling renders the region particularly vulnerable to any summer rains.

*Voting Records From RSFSR Legislature

90UN2261A Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 26, 30 Jun-6 Jul 90 pp 4-6

[Editorial Report: "Who Voted for What"]

[Text] **The work of the First Congress of People's Deputies of the RSFSR concluded on 22 June. We offer for your attention the results of the roll-call voting on the most critical and fundamental questions.**

1. On the sovereignty of the RSFSR and the new Union Treaty. Paragraph 5 (on the supremacy of the RSFSR Constitution and laws of the RSFSR on the entire territory of the RSFSR).
   Voted "for" 544
   Voted "against" 271
   Abstained 30
   Decision passed
2. Decree on power
   Voted "for" 532
   Voted "against" 353
   Abstained 41
   Decision passed
3. Resolution of the Congress of People's Deputies of the RSFSR "On the Mechanism of Government by the People in the RSFSR" (draft). Article 1. In the RSFSR it is not permitted to combine the position of leader of a party body or government with a leadership position in a political party or socio-political organization.
   Voted "for" 804
   Voted "against" 55
   Abstained 23
   Decision passed
4. Article 2. Judges, procurators, and officials of law enforcement agencies of the RSFSR suspend their membership in parties and socio-political organization for the entire period of office.
   Voted "for" 475
   Voted "against" 417
   Abstained 31
   Decision not passed
5. Article 3. As a legislative initiative, the Congress of People's Deputies of the RSFSR submits a proposal to the supreme bodies of state power of the USSR on eliminating party and political leadership bodies in the armed forces.
   Voted "for" 462
   Voted "against" 378
   Abstained 31
   Decision decision not passed
6. Resolution of the Congress of People's Deputies of the RSFSR "On Delimination of Governing Functions on the Territory of the RSFSR"
   Voted "for" 695
   Voted "against" 38
   Abstained 21
   Decision passed

For convenience in examining the data provided in below, we have used the following symbols: "+" indicates voting for; "-" indicates voting against; "A" indicates abstained; and "O" indicates absent.

Two people's deputies of the RSFSR were elected already during the work of the Congress and were not able to participate in the voting on all questions. Blanks are left opposite their names.

Some Results of Roll-Call Voting

Name	Questions					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Ababko, A.I.	+	+	O	+	+	+
2. Abaydulin, Z.Z.	O	+	O	-	-	A
3. Abdulatipov, R.G.	O	O	O	O	O	+
4. Abdulbasirov, M.M.	-	A	+	-	-	+

Some Results of Roll-Call Voting

Name	Questions					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. Abramov, I.A.	O	-	O	-	-	+
6. Abrarov, V.I.	+	O	O	O	O	O
7. Avdonin, I.Ya.	+	+	+	+	+	+
8. Agalov, V.K.	+	A	O	O	O	O
9. Agafonov, V.A.	-	-	+	-	-	+
10. Ageyev, G.Ye.	O	-	+	-	-	+
11. Adrov, A.N.	O	+	+	+	+	+
12. Adrov, V.M.	+	+	+	+	+	+
13. Aksenov, N.D.	O	+	+	-	+	+
14. Aksyuchits, V.V.	+	+	+	+	+	+
15. Alayev, Ye.I.	-	-	O	O	O	O
16. Aleksandrov, M.A.	-	-	+	-	-	+
17. Alekseyev, A.A.	+	+	+	+	+	+
18. Alekseyev, G.A.	+	+	+	+	+	+
19. Aliyev, N.A.	A	-	+	-	-	+
20. Aliroyev, I.I.	+	+	+	+	+	+
21. Altukhov, I.A.	+	+	+	+	+	O
22. Ambartsumov, Ye.A.	+	O	O	+	O	O
23. Aminov, N.G.	-	-	+	+	-	+
24. Ananyev, A.M.	+	-	A	-	-	O
25. Andreyev, S.N.	+	+	+	+	+	+
26. Andronov, I.I.	+	+	+	+	+	+
27. Andropov, S.N.	+	+	+	+	+	+
28. Anikiyev, A.V.	-	O	O	O	O	O
29. Anipkin, A.M.	O	O	+	-	-	+
30. Anichkin, I.S.	-	-	+	-	-	+
31. Anishchev, V.P.	O	+	+	A	A	O
32. Anokhin, V.M.	+	+	+	+	+	+
33. Anoshkin, B.P.	-	-	-	-	-	O
34. Antonov, V.V.	-	-	O	O	O	O
35. Antonov, Yu.Ya.	O	+	O	O	O	+
36. Arzhannikov, N.M.	O	+	+	+	+	+
37. Arsanov, A.B.	-	+	O	-	-	O
38. Arslanova, F.Sh.	A	-	+	+	+	O
39. Arteyev, V.D.	O	+	+	+	+	+
40. Artyunov, M.G.	+	+	O	+	+	+
41. Askalonov, A.A.	+	+	+	+	-	O
42. Aslakhanov, A.A.	-	+	+	+	-	+
43. Astafyev, M.G.	+	+	+	+	+	+
44. Atlasov, V.G.	O	-	O	O	O	+
45. Akhmedzyanov, G.I.	O	+	+	+	+	+
46. Akhmetov, A.N.	+	+	+	+	+	O
47. Akhmetkhanov, R.M.	O	+	+	+	-	+

Some Results of Roll-Call Voting

Name	Questions					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
48. Akhmetkhanov, S.M.	O	-	+	+	+	O
49. Akhtyamov, D.S.	+	-	-	-	+	+
50. Akhunov, R.M.	+	+	+	+	+	+
51. Achalov, V.A.	+	-	-	-	-	-
52. Ayushiyev, B.V.	-	-	O	O	O	O
53. Babayev, B.D.	-	-	+	-	-	+
54. Babenko V.D.	+	+	+	+	+	O
55. Babichev, V.S.	A	-	+	-	-	C
56. Babkin, V.V.	O	+	+	+	+	O
57. Baburin, S.N.	+	-	+	+	+	+
58. Bagandaliyev, M.B.	O	+	+	-	-	+
59. Bagautdinov, R.Z.	O	-	+	O	A	O
60. Badmayev, S.A.	+	-	+	-	-	+
61. Baykalov, V.P.	+	+	+	-	O	O
62. Bakiyev, R.S.	+	-	+	-	-	+
63. Balala, V.A.	+	+	+	+	+	+
64. Balovnev, V.P.	O	+	+	+	-	+
65. Barabanov, V.A.	+	+	+	+	+	+
66. Baranov, V.N.	+	+	+	+	+	+
67. Baranov, Ye.I.	+	-	+	-	-	O
68. Barmin, N.Yu.	+	+	+	O	O	+
69. Baronenko, A.S.	-	A	+	+	-	+
70. Barsukov, A.D.	+	+	+	+	+	+
71. Barsukov, A.I.	O	-	+	+	-	+
72. Bartoshkin, E.D.	+	O	+	-	-	+
73. Barybin, M.A.	O	-	+	-	-	+
74. Basilashvili, O.V.	+	O	+	+	O	+
75. Basin, Ye.V.	+	+	+	+	A	+
76. Batagov, T.D.	-	+	+	O	A	O
77. Bakhtiyarova, L.Kh.	+	-	+	A	A	+
78. Bezverkhiy, S.F.	O	-	+	-	O	O
79. Bezrodnyy, N.A.	-	+	+	-	+	O
80. Bezrukov, I.A.	+	+	+	+	+	+
81. Beketov, V.P.	-	-	+	-	-	+
82. Belashov, A.I.	+	+	+	-	-	+
83. Belin, K.M.	O	-	O	-	-	O
84. Belkin, G.G.	-	-	+	-	-	+
85. Beloborodov, A.G.	+	+	+	+	+	+
86. Belov, V.I.	+	+	+	+	+	+
87. Beloglazov, Yu.M.	+	O	+	+	+	+
88. Belonogov, A.N.	-	-	O	O	O	O
89. Belorusov, A.Ye.	+	+	+	-	+	+
90. Belyk, Yu.V.	+	+	+	+	+	O

Some Results of Roll-Call Voting

Name	Questions					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
91. Belyayev, A.A.	+	O	O	O	O	O
92. Benov, G.M.	+	+	+	-	-	+
93. Berezkin, N.A.	+	+	O	O	O	O
94. Bereznikov, G.A.	O	-	-	O	-	O
95. Berestovoy, V.I.	-	-	+	-	-	O
96. Bespalov, V.V.	+	+	+	+	+	+
97. Bignov, R.I.	+	+	+	+	+	+
98. Bir, A.F.	O	O	+	+	+	O
99. Bichaldey, K.A.	+	A	+	+	+	+
100. Blagitko, Ye.M.	+	-	+	-	-	+
101. Blinov, A.K.	+	O	+	+	+	+
102. Blokhin, A.V.	+	+	+	+	+	+
103. Bobikov, A.A.	+	O	O	O	O	O
104. Bobkhov, F.D.	-	-	O	-	-	+
105. Bogayenko, N.V.	+	+	+	+	+	+
106. Bogatyrev, B.B.	+	-	+	+	+	O
107. Bogachev, Ye.B.	+	O	+	-	-	O
108. Bogdanov, V.Ye.	-	-	O	-	-	O
109. Bogdanov, V.L.	O	O	+	O	O	+
110. Bogomolov, G.A.	O	O	O	O	O	O
111. Bodyakshin, V.S.	-	-	A	-	-	+
112. Boyko, V.A.	+	+	+	-	A	+
113. Bok, V.F.	-	-	+	-	-	+
114. Bokov, V.A.	O	-	O	-	-	O
115. Bolotov, I.A.	O	-	-	-	-	O
116. Bolshakov, B.T.	+	+	+	+	+	+
117. Bolsheglazov, A.I.	+	-	+	+	+	+
118. Bondarev, V.P.	-	-	A	-	-	-
119. Bondarev, G.S.	+	O	+	+	+	+
120. Bondarchuk, N.M.	+	+	+	-	-	+
121. Borzenko, V.S.	+	+	+	+	A	+
122. Boriskin, O.A.	O	-	-	-	O	O
123. Borodin, P.P.	-	-	+	-	-	+
124. Bocharov, V.I.	+	-	+	-	-	O
125. Bocharov, M.A.	+	+	+	+	+	+
126. Bochkarev, V.K.	+	O	+	O	-	O
127. Bragin, V.I.	+	+	+	+	+	+
128. Bratishchev, I.M.	-	-	+	-	-	+
129. Brechalov, A.V.	+	+	+	+	+	+
130. Brusnikin, N.Yu.	O	+	O	O	O	O
131. Bryukhovetskiy, V.F.	+	+	+	+	+	+
132. Bubyakin, D.S.	+	O	O	O	O	O
133. Bugrimov, A.L.	+	+	+	+	+	+

Some Results of Roll-Call Voting

Name	Questions					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
134. Budin, V.P.	+	O	O	O	O	O
135. Bulayev, Yu.A.	O	+	+	-	+	+
136. Bulakh, A.P.	+	+	+	-	-	+
137. Buldayev, S.N.	-	-	O	-	-	+
138. Bulygin, V.V.	-	-	+	-	-	O
139. Buslov, N.G.	+	-	+	-	O	+
140. Butorin, A.N.	O	+	+	+	+	+
141. Bystrov, S.N.	-	-	-	-	-	+
142. Bytsyura, N.P.	-	O	+	O	-	A
143. Bychkov, V.P.	+	+	+	+	+	O
144. Vaynshteyn, V.Kh.	+	O	+	+	+	O
145. Valeyev, R.R.	+	A	+	+	+	+
146. Varnavskiy, V.A.	A	A	+	A	O	+
147. Varov, V.K.	O	+	O	+	O	+
148. Varukhin, V.G.	+	+	+	+	+	+
149. Varshavskiy, M.N.	-	-	-	-	-	O
150. Vasilyev, V.P.	+	O	A	+	A	O
151. Vasilyev, V.Z.	+	+	A	A	A	+
152. Vasilyev, D.A.	+	+	+	+	+	-
153. Vasilkovskiy, A.Ye.	-	-	+	-	-	-
154. Vasyanovich, A.M.	+	O	+	-	O	+
155. Vedernikov, N.T.	+	O	+	+	-	+
156. Vedernikov, E.V.	O	+	+	+	A	+
157. Veremchuk, V.R.	+	+	+	+	+	O
158. Veretennikov, G.V.	+	+	+	+	+	+
159. Vertogradskaya, I.A.	-	-	+	+	+	+
160. Vershinin, V.I.	-	O	O	O	O	O
161. Vershinin, I.N.	+	+	O	O	O	O
162. Veshnyakov, A.A.	O	+	+	+	+	+
163. Viktorov, V.P.	+	-	O	O	O	O
164. Vilchek, M.I.	-	+	+	-	+	+
165. Vinogradova, I.V.	-	A	+	+	A	+
166. Vitebskiy, V.Ya.	+	-	+	-	+	O
167. Vitebskiy, Ya.D.	+	O	+	-	+	O
168. Vishnevskiy, Yu.G.	+	+	+	-	+	O
169. Vishnyakov, I.I.	+	-	+	A	-	+
170. Vlasov, A.V.	-	O	O	O	O	-
171. Vlasov, V.M.	-	-	-	-	-	O
172. Voznesenskiy, V.N.	+	+	+	+	+	+
173. Volkov, A.P.	-	-	O	O	O	+
174. Volkov, V.V.	+	+	+	+	+	+
175. Volkov, L.V.	+	+	+	+	O	O
176. Volkov, O.A.	-	O	+	+	+	+

Some Results of Roll-Call Voting

Name	Questions					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
177. Volkov, S.P.	-	O	+	-	-	+
178. Volkogonov, D.A.	O	+	+	+	A	O
179. Vologdin, L.N.	+	-	+	+	+	+
180. Volodin, N.A.	O	-	O	O	O	O
181. Voloshchuk, R.N.	+	+	+	-	-	O
182. Volyntsev, A.A.	-	-	-	-	-	+
183. Voronin, A.I.	O	-	O	O	-	+
184. Voronin, L.A.	O	O	+	-	-	A
185. Voronin, Yu.M.	O	-	+	-	+	O
186. Vorontsov, V.A.	+	+	+	+	+	O
187. Vorontsov, N.N.	O	O	O	O	O	+
188. Vorotnikov, V.I.	O	O	O	O	O	O
189. Vorfolomeyev, V.P.	-	A	+	-	-	+
190. Vtyurin, A.V.	-	-	+	-	-	A
191. Vyucheyskiy, V.A.	-	-	O	O	-	O
192. Vyalkov, A.I.	-	+	+	+	+	+
193. Vyatkin, V.L.	+	O	+	-	-	+
194. Vyatkin, G.P.	-	+	+	-	-	O
195. Gabitov, I.A.	-	-	+	-	-	+
196. Gabrus, V.A.	A	-	+	-	-	+
197. Gavrilov, A.A.	+	+	+	+	+	+
198. Galazov, A.Kh.	-	-	O	O	O	O
199. Galeyev, R.G.	+	-	+	-	-	O
200. Galiley, N.G.	+	+	+	-	A	+
201. Galushko, I.V.	-	+	A	-	O	A
202. Galushko, I.Ye.	-	-	O	-	-	O
203. Garipov, F.G.	O	-	+	-	-	+
204. Garkusha, V.F.	-	-	O	-	-	O
205. Gen, N.L.	O	-	+	A	A	+
206. Gerasimenko, A.D.	-	O	+	-	-	+
207. Gerasimov, V.P.	+	-	O	-	-	+
208. Gerasimov, V.I.	-	+	+	-	+	+
209. Germanenko, V.S.	+	+	+	-	-	+
210. Gerold, Yu.A.	O	+	O	+	+	+
211. Gekht, Yu.G.	O	-	O	O	O	O
212. Gladkikh, V.S.	+	+	+	+	+	+
213. Glotov, S.A.	+	+	+	+	A	+
214. Golishnikov, A.M.	+	+	+	+	+	+
215. Golovin, A.L.	+	+	+	+	O	+
216. Gololobov, V.A.	+	+	+	+	+	+
217. Golubkin, V.P.	-	-	+	-	-	+
218. Gomzikov, A.I.	-	+	+	-	+	+
219. Gorban, S.F.	+	+	+	+	+	+

Some Results of Roll-Call Voting

Name	Questions					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
220. Gorbachevskiy, N.M.	+	+	O	+	+	O
221. Gorbunov, A.P.	O	-	+	-	-	O
222. Gorbunov, G.A.	+	-	+	-	-	+
223. Gorbunov, P.I.	O	-	-	-	-	O
224. Gorelov, G.V.	+	+	+	+	+	+
225. Gorodilov, V.A.	O	A	+	+	+	+
226. Gorst, R.Kh.	O	-	O	-	A	O
227. Gorchakov, G.M.	+	A	+	-	+	+
228. Goryachev, Yu.F.	O	-	-	-	-	O
229. Goryacheva, S.P.	-	-	+	+	-	+
230. Gosporyan, F.G.	+	+	+	+	+	+
231. Granberg, A.G.	-	+	+	-	A	+
232. Grankin, V.Ye.	O	+	+	+	+	O
233. Grankin, V.T.	-	+	+	+	-	O
234. Grachev, V.A.	-	-	O	A	-	+
235. Grechannikov, V.M.	-	-	-	-	-	O
236. Greshnevikov, A.N.	+	+	+	+	+	+
237. Grigoryev, N.G.	-	-	+	-	-	O
238. Gritsenko, N.P.	+	-	-	-	O	O
239. Grishin, B.M.	O	-	+	-	-	+
240. Grishin, N.P.	+	O	O	O	O	+
241. Gromov, Yu.G.	+	+	+	-	-	+
242. Gubskiy, V.M.	-	O	+	-	-	+
243. Guzhvin, A.P.	+	-	+	-	-	+
244. Gulko, Yu.A.	O	O	O	O	O	+
245. Gulishko, V.A.	+	-	+	-	-	+
246. Gun, R.S.	O	+	+	+	+	+
247. Gurevich, L.B.	+	+	+	+	+	+
248. Gurkalov, P.I.	-	-	+	+	-	+
249. Gurov, A.I.	+	-	+	-	+	+
250. Guskov, V.V.	A	-	+	-	A	+
251. Guskov, Yu.A.	O	-	+	-	-	+
252. Gushchin, V.A.	A	-	O	O	O	+
253. Danilina, V.M.	O	+	+	+	A	+
254. Dankov, G.A.	+	+	+	+	-	+
255. Dvugov, S.A.	+	+	+	+	-	+
256. Demidov, A.V.	O	+	+	-	-	-
257. Demina, V.S.	A	-	O	O	O	O
258. Denioyenko, B.A.	+	+	+	+	O	+
259. Derendyayev, S.B.	+	-	+	-	+	+
260. Deryagin, A.V.	+	+	+	+	+	+
261. Desyatnikov, V.A.	+	A	+	-	-	+
262. Dzhamaldinov, S.Sh.	-	+	+	+	+	+

Some Results of Roll-Call Voting

Name	Questions					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
263. Didichenko, G.I.	+	+	+	+	+	+
264. Dimitrenko, A.F.	+	+	+	+	+	+
265. Dmitriyev, V.V.	+	+	+	+	+	+
266. Dmitriyev, M.E.	O	+	O	O	O	+
267. Dmitriyev, Yu.Ya.	+	-	+	+	+	+
268. Dobzhinskiy, D.P.	+	+	+	+	+	O
269. Dovgyallo, A.I.	-	-	+	-	+	+
270. Doyev, K.M.	+	A	+	A	-	O
271. Dolgov, V.V.	+	-	+	-	-	+
272. Doliatov, V.P.	O	+	+	-	-	+
273. Domnina, V.A.	+	+	+	+	O	+
274. Donskikh, V.V.	-	-	+	-	-	O
275. Dordzhiyev, V.P.	+	-	+	-	-	+
276. Dorkin, V.I.	+	O	+	+	+	+
277. Dorofeyev, V.M.	+	-	-	-	-	-
278. Dorofeyev, G.P.	+	+	+	+	+	+
279. Drobin, A.L.	+	+	+	-	-	+
280. Drozhdin, B.I.	+	-	+	-	-	O
281. Drozdenko, V.N.	+	+	+	+	+	+
282. Dronov, V.D.	+	+	+	+	A	+
283. Druganov, S.P.	+	+	+	+	+	+
284. Dubrovskiy, A.V.	+	-	+	-	A	O
285. Dubrovskiy, M.G.	+	+	+	+	+	+
286. Duyev, V.N.	O	+	+	O	+	+
287. Dunayev, A.F.	O	+	+	-	-	+
288. Durasov, M.Yu.	+	+	+	+	+	+
289. Dyakonov, V.N.	+	+	+	+	+	+
290. Dyudyayev, G.T.	+	-	O	O	O	O
291. Yevdokimov, A.G.	A	-	+	+	+	A
292. Yevdokimov, V.I.	+	+	+	+	+	+
293. Yevdokimov, V.N.	+	+	+	+	+	O
294. Yevdokimov, L.P.	O	O	O	O	O	O
295. Yevstratov, V.A.	O	-	+	-	-	+
296. Yevtushenko, K.M.	+	+	+	+	+	+
297. Yegorov, A.N.	+	+	+	+	+	+
298. Yegorov, V.A.	+	+	+	+	+	+
299. Yegorov, V.N.	O	O	O	O	O	O
300. Yegorov, Ye.V.	-	-	+	-	-	-
301. Yegorov, N.S.	+	+	+	+	+	+
302. Yegorov, Yu.A.	-	-	+	+	+	O
303. Yegorshin, V.M.	+	+	O	-	+	O
304. Yeliseykin, S.I.	+	+	+	+	+	+
305. Yeltsin, B.N.	+	+	+	-	+	+

Some Results of Roll-Call Voting

Name	Questions					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
306. Yeltsov, V.N.	+	+	O	O	O	O
307. Yeltsov, Yu.A.	+	+	+	+	+	+
308. Yelshin, Yu.V.	-	-	-	+	+	+
309. Yeremin, A.Ye.	+	-	+	-	-	+
310. Yeremin, I.Yu.	+	+	+	+	+	+
311. Yermakov, V.F.	-	-	-	-	-	A
312. Yermolayev, A.M.	O	+	+	+	+	+
313. Yermolayev, V.Ya.	A	-	+	-	-	O
314. Yeroshin, Ye.F.	+	+	+	+	+	+
315. Yeroshkin, S.S.	O	-	+	-	-	+
316. Yershov, N.N.	+	+	+	+	+	+
317. Yesaulov, V.N.	+	-	+	-	-	+
318. Yeskov, Yu.A.	+	+	+	+	+	+
319. Yefimov, V.N.	-	+	+	+	+	O
320. Yefremov, S.I.	+	+	+	-	-	+
321. Zhenin, V.A.	+	+	+	+	+	+
322. Zhigaylo, V.N.	O	-	O	O	O	O
323. Zhiganov, V.I.	-	-	A	-	-	+
324. Zhigulin, V.I.	O	+	+	+	+	+
325. Zhilin, I.F.	+	+	+	+	+	+
326 Zhilkin, A.A.	+	O	+	-	-	+
327. Zhiltsov, Yu.I.	O	+	+	-	-	+
328. Zhochkin, N.M.	O	O	+	-	-	+
329. Zhukov, G.S.	+	A	+	O	O	+
330. Zhukov, M.M.	+	+	+	+	-	+
331. Zhuravel, Ye.N.	+	+	+	+	+	+
332. Zavgayev, D.G.	O	O	+	-	-	O
333. Zaveryukha, A.Kh.	-	-	+	-	-	O
334. Zavodchikov, L.V.	+	+	+	-	-	+
335. Zadonskiy, G.I.	+	+	+	+	+	+
336. Zaytsev, N.A.	-	-	+	-	-	O
337. Zaytsev, Yu.V.	+	+	+	+	+	+
338. Zaytseva, L.M.	+	+	+	+	-	O
339. Zakopyrin, A.N.	-	+	+	+	A	+
340. Zalevskaya, I.F.	+	+	+	+	+	+
341. Zanin, Yu.S.	O	O	O	O	O	+
342. Zargishiyev, M.R.	O	O	+	+	+	O
343. Zarubin, V.I.	+	-	+	-	-	O
344. Zasukhin, S.F.	+	+	O	+	+	+
345. Zakharov, A.A.	+	+	+	+	+	+
346. Zakharov, V.S.	-	-	+	-	A	-
347. Zakharov, M.L.	+	+	+	+	+	O
348. Zakharov, M.M.	+	-	+	-	-	O

Some Results of Roll-Call Voting

Name	Questions					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
349. Zbronzhko I.V.	+	O	+	+	+	O
350. Zalepukhin, A.G.	-	-	+	-	-	+
351. Zerin, P.I.	O	O	+	-	-	O
352. Zilist, M.N.	-	-	A	-	-	O
353. Zinovyev, V.S.	+	+	+	+	+	+
354. Zlobin, A.A.	+	+	+	+	+	-
355. Zolotarev, P.T.	+	-	O	O	O	+
356. Zolotukhin, B.A.	+	+	+	+	+	+
357. Zorkaltsev, V.I.	+	-	-	-	-	O
358. Zotkina, Ye.V.	+	-	+	-	-	+
359. Zubkhov, B.F.	O	-	O	O	O	O
360. Zudilov, V.V.	-	-	+	-	-	A
361. Zyatkov, N.I.	O	+	+	+	+	+
362. Ivanilov, Yu.P.	+	+	+	+	+	+
363. Ivanov, V.M.	+	-	+	-	-	+
364. Ivanov, Vik.A.	A	-	+	-	A	A
365. Ivanov, Vl.A.	-	O	+	+	+	O
366. Ivanov, I.B.	-	-	+	-	-	O
367. Ivanov, M.P.	+	+	+	-	+	+
368. Ivanov, N.P.	-	-	O	-	-	O
369. Ivanov, P.A.	+	+	+	+	+	O
370. Ivanov, P.S.	-	-	+	-	-	-
371. Ivanov, S.I.	-	A	O	O	O	O
372. Ivanov, S.N.	+	O	A	+	+	+
373. Ivanov, S.P.	O	A	+	+	+	+
374. Ivanov, F.F.	+	+	+	+	+	+
375. Ivanova, T.G.	-	-	+	-	-	+
376. Ivanchenko, A.A.	-	-	-	-	-	+
377. Ivlev, I.A.	O	-	+	-	-	O
378. Ivlev, N.I.	+	A	+	-	-	+
379. Ivchenkov, S.S.	+	+	O	+	+	+
380. Idelbayeva, G.A.	O	+	+	-	O	O
381. Ikonnikov, V.I.	+	O	+	A	+	+
382. Ilovskiy, V.S.	+	+	+	+	+	+
383. Ilyenkov, A.I.	O	-	+	-	-	-
384. Ilyumzhinov, K.N.	+	+	+	+	+	+
385. Imedoyev, P.M.	A	O	O	O	O	O
386. Inshakov, F.N.	+	+	+	-	-	+
387. Isayev, B.M.	O	-	+	-	+	+
388. Isayev, V.A.	+	+	+	+	+	O
389. Isakov, V.B.	A	O	O	O	O	+
390. Ispravnikov, V.O.	+	+	+	+	A	+
391. Kadmenskiy, S.G.	+	+	+	+	+	+

Some Results of Roll-Call Voting

Name	Questions					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
392. Kadochnikov, V.D.	-	-	O	-	-	O
393. Kadyrov, R.Z.	-	-	-	-	-	+
394. Kadyshev, V.D.	O	+	+	+	+	+
395. Kazakov, N.P.	+	+	+	+	+	+
396. Kazakov, S.I.	+	-	+	-	-	+
397. Kazarov, O.V.	-	O	-	-	-	O
398. Kaziyev, T.V.	O	A	+	-	O	O
399. Kalashnikov, V.V.	-	-	-	-	-	+
400. Kalenov, V.I.	O	O	O	O	O	O
401. Kalinina, R.I.	-	+	+	+	+	O
402. Kalinich, A.F.	+	+	+	+	+	O
403. Kalistratov, G.S.	+	-	+	-	O	+
404. Kalyuzhnyy, G.I.	-	+	+	+	A	+
405. Kamanin, Ye.I.	+	+	+	-	-	+
406. Kamenev, A.A.	-	A	+	+	-	+
407. Kapustyanskiy, V.G.	-	A	+	A	A	+
408. Karanets, Yu.K.	-	-	O	-	-	O
409. Karachurik, R.A.	O	O	O	O	O	O
410. Karev, M.M.	-	-	O	O	O	O
411. Karpov, P.A.	+	+	+	+	O	O
412. Karulin, N.N.	-	-	O	O	O	O
413. Kartsevskiy, A.V.	+	+	+	+	+	+
414. Katasonov, Yu.I.	O	+	+	+	+	+
415. Kaufman, M.M.	-	-	+	-	-	A
416. Kachanov, O.Yu.	+	+	+	+	+	+
417. Kachurin, Yu.M.	-	-	+	+	-	O
418. Kashin, N.P.	-	-	+	-	-	+
419. Kashnikov, N.M.	+	+	+	-	+	+
420. Kekhlerov, S.G.	-	O	+	-	A	+
421. Kibirev, B.G.	O	-	O	-	-	+
422. Kim, Ye.N.	+	+	+	+	+	+
423. Kirillov, V.Ya.	+	+	+	+	+	+
424. Kirichenko, L.M.	-	+	+	+	+	O
425. Kirpichnikov, V.A.	-	-	O	-	O	+
426. Kiselev, V.V.	+	+	+	+	+	A
427. Kiselev, M.M.	+	+	+	O	+	+
428. Kislitsyn, V.A.	+	+	+	+	+	+
429. Kislyuk, M.B.	O	O	+	+	+	+
430. Kitov, Yu.B.	A	-	+	A	+	O
431. Klepikova, R.A.	-	A	+	A	-	+
432. Klimenokh, A.L.	+	+	+	+	+	+
433. Klyuvgant, V.V.	+	+	+	+	+	+
434. Klyuyev, N.V.	+	-	+	+	+	O

Some Results of Roll-Call Voting

Name	Questions					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
435. Kobets, K.I.	O	-	+	-	-	+
436. Kobzev, A.V.	+	+	O	+	+	+
437. Kovalev, A.Ya.	+	+	+	+	+	O
438. Kovalev, V.A.	+	+	-	A	-	-
439. Kovalev, L.I.	-	-	+	-	-	O
440. Kovalev, N.A.	O	+	+	+	+	O
441. Kovalev, S.A.	+	+	+	+	+	+
442. Kovlyagin, A.F.	O	-	O	O	O	O
443. Kovtunov, A.V.	-	-	+	-	-	O
444. Kogan, L.I.	-	+	O	+	+	+
445. Kozhin, A.S.	O	O	A	A	A	O
446. Kozhokin, Ye.M.	+	+	+	+	+	+
447. Kozayev, G.S.	-	A	+	A	A	+
448. Kozlov, N.D.	-	-	+	-	-	+
449. Kozlova, L.V.	+	+	+	+	+	+
450. Kozyr, V.I.	+	+	+	+	+	O
451. Kokov, V.M.	O	O	+	-	-	+
452. Kokoshnikov, Yu.P.	-	-	+	-	-	+
453. Koksharov, B.N.	-	O	O	-	-	O
454. ...olganov, A.V.	-	O	-	O	-	O
455. Kolodeznikov, V.N.	+	+	+	+	-	-
456. Koltunov, A.B.	O	-	+	-	-	O
457. Komkov, V.P.	-	-	+	-	-	+
458. Komchatov, V.F.	+	+	O	+	+	+
459. Kondobayev, G.S.	+	+	+	+	+	+
460. Kondrashov, B.P.	+	+	+	+	+	+
461. Kondryukov, G.F.	+	-	+	-	O	+
462. Konev, V.S.	O	O	+	-	-	+
463. Konovalov, B.A.	+	O	+	+	+	+
464. Kononov, A.L.	+	+	+	+	+	+
465. Konstantinov, G.Ye.	-	+	+	-	+	+
466. Konstantinov, I.V.	+	+	+	+	+	+
467. Kopeyka, A.K.	+	+	+	+	O	O
468. Koptenkho, I.I.	+	+	+	+	+	+
469. Kopylov, A.T.	+	+	+	+	+	+
470. Korepanov, Yu.I.	+	+	+	+	+	+
471. Kornilov, Yu.I.	A	-	-	-	-	O
472. Kornilova, Z.A.	-	-	+	-	-	O
473. Korovnikov, A.V.	-	-	O	O	-	O
474. Korolev, V.F.	+	+	+	+	+	+
475. Korolev, Yu.V.	O	O	+	-	-	+
476. Korshunov, L.A.	-	+	+	O	-	+
477. Koryagina, T.I.	+	+	+	+	+	+

Some Results of Roll-Call Voting

Name	Questions					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
478. Kosopkin, A.S.	+	+	+	+	+	+
479. Kostin, A.M.	+	A	+	O	A	+
480. Kostoyev, I.Yu.	O	+	+	+	+	+
481. Kostyurin, A.I.	+	A	O	-	-	A
482. Kotelnikov, V.I.	+	+	+	+	+	+
483. Kotenkov, A.A.	+	+	+	+	+	+
484. Kotlyarenko, F.M.	+	-	+	-	-	+
485. Kravchenko, N.P.	+	-	-	-	-	+
486. Kramkov, V.I.	-	-	O	O	O	O
487. Krasavchenko, S.N.	+	+	+	+	O	O
488. Krasnov, Yu.M.	O	-	+	-	-	-
489. Krasov, D.I.	-	O	+	O	O	+
490. Krestyaninov, L.A.	-	+	+	-	+	+
491. Krivoshapkin, A.V.	+	-	+	-	-	-
492. Krivchenko, A.A.	+	+	+	+	+	+
493. Kropotov, I.Ye.	-	-	-	-	A	O
494. Krymov, A.V.	+	O	+	+	+	+
495. Kryvchkov, V.V.	+	+	+	+	+	+
496. Kryazhevskikh, N.F.	O	-	+	-	-	O
497. Kudinova, L.S.	+	+	+	+	+	+
498. Kuznetsov, A.M.	+	+	+	+	+	+
499. Kuznetsov, V.A.	O	A	+	-	A	+
500. Kuznetsov, V.M.	+	+	+	+	O	+
501. Kuznetsov, Ye.S.	+	+	+	+	+	+
502. Kuznetsov, N.N.	+	A	+	+	+	+
503. Kuznetsov, Yu.N.	-	-	-	-	-	+
504. Kuzmin, B.G.	-	-	+	-	-	+
505. Kuzmin, V.G.	+	+	+	+	+	+
506. Kuzmin, Yu.I.	+	+	+	+	+	+
507. Kulakov, V.N.	O	+	+	O	O	+
508. Kulakovskiy, A.V.	+	+	+	+	A	O
509. Kulesha, V.A.	+	+	+	+	O	+
510. Kurenkov, Yu.V.	A	+	+	+	+	O
511. Kuritsyn, P.D.	+	+	+	+	+	O
512. Kurkova, B.A.	O	+	+	+	+	+
513. Kurochkin, A.P.	+	+	+	+	-	O
514. Kuts, G.A.	-	-	O	-	-	+
515. Kucherenko, I.M.	+	+	O	O	O	+
516. Kushnarev, A.L.	+	+	+	+	A	+
517. Kushnarev, L.N.	+	+	+	+	-	+
518. Kushnarenko, N.I.	-	-	+	O	-	O
519. Kyshtymov, S.L.	+	+	+	+	+	+
520. Layerushin, N.I.	A	-	+	+	+	O

Some Results of Roll-Call Voting

Name	Questions					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
521. Lazarev, V.P.	+	+	+	+	+	+
522. Lazchenko, K.N.	+	-	+	-	-	+
523. Laptev, M.N.	+	-	+	-	-	+
524. Laptev, N.I.	+	+	+	O	O	O
525. Laptev, P.D.	-	-	+	-	-	+
526. Lapshin, M.I.	+	+	+	+	+	+
527. Lattserds, V.Ya.	-	O	O	-	+	+
528. Latyshev, P.M.	+	+	+	+	+	+
529. Lakhova, Ye.F.	+	A	+	+	+	+
530. Lachugin, I.G.	+	O	-	-	+	+
531. Lebedev, Yu.A.	+	+	+	+	+	+
532. Leontyev, A.M.	-	-	+	-	-	O
533. Leontyev, A.P.	+	O	+	-	-	+
534. Lepyavka, V.Ya.	+	+	+	+	+	+
535. Leta, T.I.	+	+	+	-	+	+
536. Linkova, V.V.	+	+	+	+	+	+
537. Lisin, V.P.	A	O	+	A	A	O
538. Litvinov, Yu.A.	+	-	+	+	+	O
539. Litovchenko, A.P.	O	-	+	-	-	-
540. Likhachev, V.I.	-	-	O	-	-	O
541. Loginov, V.P.	-	+	+	+	+	+
542. Lodkin, Yu.Ye.	+	+	+	-	A	+
543. Loza, L.I.	O	A	+	-	+	+
544. Lomach, M.M.	+	-	O	-	-	+
545. Loptev, V.P.	-	-	+	-	-	O
546. Lotkov, V N.	+	+	+	+	O	+
547. Lugovoy, A.N.	+	+	+	A	+	+
548. Luzyanin, G.S.	A	O	+	-	-	A
549. Lukashov, F.P.	+	+	+	+	+	+
550. Lukin, V.P.	-	+	+	+	O	+
551. Lunev, A.Ye.	+	O	A	-	+	+
552. Lunin, V.V.	+	+	+	+	O	+
553. Luppov, A.M.	+	-	+	-	-	O
554. Luchinskiy, Yu.M.	+	+	+	A	+	+
555. Lysenko, B.I.	+	+	+	+	+	O
556. Lysenko, V.A.	+	+	+	+	+	+
557. Lysenko, V.N.	+	+	+	+	+	+
558. Lysov, P.A.	O	+	+	+	+	+
559. Lyubimov, A.M.	O	O	O	O	O	O
560. Lyubimov, V.N.	A	-	+	-	A	+
561. Magomedov, M.M.	-	-	+	O	-	+
562. Mazayev, V.D.	-	O	+	A	+	+
563. Maymago, G.N.	-	O	O	O	O	O

Some Results of Roll-Call Voting

Name	Questions					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
564. Makarkin, N.P.	O	+	O	O	O	+
565. Makarov, V.P.	+	+	O	+	+	+
566. Makarov, Yu.S.	-	-	+	-	-	A
567. Makeyev, A.I.	-	-	+	-	-	-
568. Makin, N.I.	+	+	+	-	-	+
569. Maley, M.D.	+	+	+	+	+	+
570. Malinkin, Yu.A.	O	-	+	-	-	+
571. Maldov, V.A.	+	+	+	-	-	+
572. Malkov, N.I.	-	-	O	-	-	O
573. Maltsev, I.M.	O	-	+	-	-	+
574. Maltsev, N.S.	-	-	+	O	-	+
575. Maltsev, S.V.	+	+	+	+	+	+
576. Mamkhegov, M.Sh.	+	-	+	-	-	+
577. Manayenkov, Yu.A.	O	O	+	O	-	O
578. Manannikov, A.P.	+	+	+	+	+	+
579. Manannikov, V.N.	+	+	+	+	+	+
580. Manarov, M.Kh.	O	O	O	O	O	-
581. Mandrygin, V.I.	A	A	+	-	A	A
582. Manokhin, A.N.	+	+	+	+	+	+
583. Manyukhin, V.M.	O	-	A	-	-	O
584. Martynov, D.D.	+	O	O	O	O	O
585. Martyanov, N.A.	+	+	+	+	+	+
586. Marchenko, N.P.	+	+	+	-	-	+
587. Mastafov, V.Zh.	O	+	+	+	+	O
588. Matochkin, Yu.S.	+	-	O	O	O	O
589. Matrosov, V.G.	+	+	+	+	+	+
590. Matchak, Ya.A.	+	+	+	-	O	+
591. Makhanov, V.I.	O	+	+	-	-	-
592. Makhiyanov, N.	-	+	+	+	+	+
593. Mashkov, V.V.	+	+	+	+	+	+
594. Medvedev, A.N.	+	+	+	+	O	-
595. Medvedev, A.S.	-	-	O	-	-	+
596. Medvedev, V.F.	+	O	O	+	+	O
597. Medvedev, N.G.	+	-	+	+	+	+
598. Medvedev, N.P.	+	+	+	+	+	+
599. Medvedev, P.A.	+	+	O	O	+	+
600. Medvedeva, N.A.	-	-	O	-	-	+
601. Melnichenko, A.K.	-	-	+	-	-	O
602. Menshikov, V.F.	+	+	+	+	+	+
603. Meremyanin, K.G.	+	-	+	-	+	+
604. Meshcherskiy, A.M.	O	+	+	+	+	+
605. Mikhailov, R.K.	O	O	+	+	+	O
606. Mikhitayev, A.K.	O	+	+	+	+	+

Some Results of Roll-Call Voting

Name	Questions					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
607. Mikov, G.S.	O	O	O	O	O	O
608. Mыkov, P.G.	+	+	O	-	-	O
609. Miller, Yu.E.	-	-	+	+	+	+
610. Mironov, V.P.	+	+	+	+	+	+
611. Mityukov, M.A.	+	+	+	+	+	+
612. Mikhaylets, G.A.	+	+	+	-	-	O
613. Mikhaylov, B.Ch.	+	-	+	-	-	+
614. Mikhaylov, V.Yu.	+	+	+	+	+	+
615. Mikhaylov, V.V.	+	-	-	-	-	+
616. Mikhaylov, V.Ya.	+	+	+	+	+	+
617. Mikhaylov, S.A.	+	+	+	+	+	+
618. Mikheyev, S.V.	O	O	O	O	O	O
619. Misharin, A.V.	+	+	+	+	+	O
620. Mishustina, L.P.	O	+	+	+	+	+
621. Mozgo, I.N.	+	+	+	+	+	+
622. Molostvov, M.M.	+	+	+	+	+	+
623. Molochkov, V.I.	-	-	O	O	O	+
624. Mongush, V.S.	-	A	O	O	O	O
625. Moor, P.S.	-	+	+	-	-	+
626. Morozov, V.A.	O	+	-	+	O	+
627. Morozov, K.A.	+	+	+	+	+	+
628. Morokin, V.I.	+	O	+	+	+	+
629. Moskvitin, A.M.	+	+	+	+	-	+
630. Moskvich, Yu.N.	O	+	+	+	+	+
631. Mostovoy, A.A.	O	O	O	O	O	O
632. Mosychenko, V.I.	O	-	O	O	O	+
633. Motin, V.N.	-	A	-	-	-	+
634. Mukubenov, M.B.	+	+	+	-	-	+
635. Mukusev, V.V.	+	+	+	-	O	+
636. Muldashev, E.R.	+	+	+	+	+	O
637. Muravyev, I.V.	+	+	+	+	+	+
638. Murenin, K.P.	O	O	O	-	-	O
639. Mukha, V.P.	O	-	O	-	O	O
640. Mukhamadiyev, R.S.	+	-	O	O	O	O
641. Myagkikh, V.N.	+	+	+	+	+	+
642. Myasnyankin, A.S.	O	-	O	-	-	O
643. Nadein, V.A.	+	+	+	A	-	+
644. Nazarenko, V.A.	+	+	+	-	-	+
645. Nazarchuk, A.G.	-	-	+	-	-	O
646. Nazdratenko, Ye.I.	O	+	+	-	O	+
647. Nazmetdinova, M.M.	+	A	+	+	A	+
648. Naymushin, A.N.	O	+	+	+	+	+
649. Natapov, S.A.	-	+	+	-	A	-

Some Results of Roll-Call Voting

Name	Questions					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
650. Naumov, S.V.	+	-	-	-	-	+
651. Nelasov, N.A.	+	O	+	+	+	+
652. Nemtsov, B.Ye.	+	+	+	+	+	+
653. Nepryayev, N.I.	+	+	+	+	+	+
654. Nesterov, Ye.K.	+	+	+	-	O	+
655. Nesterov, Yu.M.	+	+	+	O	+	O
656. Nekhay, A.M.	-	O	O	-	-	+
657. Nikitenko, N.I.	-	-	+	-	-	O
658. Nikitin, Yu.I.	-	-	-	-	-	+
659. Nikiforov, V.S.	-	O	+	O	-	O
660. Nikolayev, A.G.	-	-	+	-	O	+
661. Nikolayev, M.Ye.	-	-	O	O	O	+
662. Nikolayev, S.N.	-	-	+	-	-	O
663. Nikolskaya, G.M.	+	+	+	-	-	O
664. Nikulin, G.K.	+	+	+	+	+	O
665. Nikulin, I.P.	A	-	+	A	A	O
666. Nimayev, V.B.	+	+	+	+	+	+
667. Nifantyev, O.Ye.	O	+	O	-	O	-
668. Novikov, V.I.	+	+	+	+	+	+
669. Nozhikov, Yu.A.	O	O	O	O	O	O
670. Nosova, Ye.I.	+	+	+	+	+	O
671. Nosovets, S.A.	O	+	+	+	+	+
672. Nunuyev, S.M.	+	+	+	-	-	O
673. Ovchinnikov, V.A.	O	-	+	-	-	+
674. Ogorodnikov, N.D.	+	+	+	+	+	+
675. Odiyankov, Ye.G.	+	+	+	+	+	+
676. Ozhegov, A.I.	O	+	+	-	+	+
677. Ozerova, V.N.	O	-	+	-	-	O
678. Oykina, Z.N.	-	A	O	O	-	O
679. Oyneid, G.M.	O	+	+	O	+	+
680. Okunev, G.G.	A	-	+	-	-	+
681. Oleynik, V.I.	+	+	-	+	+	+
682. Ondar, Ch.B.	O	O	+	+	+	+
683. Onopriyev, V.I.	+	+	+	+	+	+
684. Oorzhak, Sh.D.	-	O	O	O	O	O
685. Orlov, A.I.	+	-	+	-	-	O
686. Orlov, N.N.	-	+	+	+	+	O
687. Osminin, S.A.	O	-	+	-	-	O
688. Ostapenko, E.I.	+	+	+	A	+	+
689. Ostrenkov, L.G.	A	-	+	-	-	+
690. Pavlov, N.A.	A	+	O	+	-	O
691. Pavlukhin, O.Ya.	-	-	+	-	-	O
692. Pak, N.V.	-	-	O	O	O	-

Some Results of Roll-Call Voting

Name	Questions					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
693. Pallo, V.T.	O	+	+	-	-	+
694. Pankov, A.A.	+	+	+	-	-	+
695. Paramonov, A.R.			O	O	O	+
696. Parshukov, V.D.	-	-	+	O	-	O
697. Pakhtanov, B.A.	-	-	+	-	-	+
698. Pashchenko, V.N.	-	-	+	-	-	A
699. Pekarskaya, T.K.	-	+	+	+	+	+
700. Pekedov, B.N.	-	-	-	-	-	O
701. Peruanskiy, S.S.	+	+	+	+	+	+
702. Petrenko, V.A.	+	A	+	+	+	+
703. Petrik, A.G.	-	-	+	-	-	O
704. Petrishchev, S.S.	+	+	+	+	+	O
705. Petrov, B.Ya.	+	+	+	+	+	+
706. Petrov, V.A.	-	-	-	-	-	+
707. Petrov, V.I.	-	+	+	-	-	O
708. Petrov, G.S.	O	O	+	-	-	O
709. Petrov, I.V.	-	-	+	+	O	O
710. Petukhov, A.V.	+	+	+	+	+	+
711. Petukhov, G.N.	-	-	+	-	-	+
712. Petukhov, G.I.	-	-	A	-	-	+
713. Pekhotin, A.V.	+	+	+	+	+	+
714. Pimenov, R.I.	+	+	+	+	+	+
715. Piskunov, A.A.	+	+	A	+	A	A
716. Piche-ool, A.N.	+	+	+	+	+	+
717. Pleshanov, S.L.	+	+	+	+	+	+
718. Plotnikov, O.V.	+	+	+	-	A	+
719. Ploshchenko, N.V.	+	+	+	+	-	+
720. Pogorelov, S.V.	+	+	+	A	+	+
721. Podgornov, N.M.	+	+	+	+	+	+
722. Podluzhnyy, V.Ye.	-	-	O	O	O	+
723. Podoprigora, V.N.	+	+	+	+	+	+
724. Pokrovskiy, S.S.	-	-	+	-	-	+
725. Polevoy, N.I.	+	+	+	-	+	+
726. Polenov, F.D.	+	+	+	+	+	O
727. Poleshchuk, F.F.	+	+	+	-	+	+
728. Politkovskiy, A.V.	+	+	+	+	+	+
729. Polozkov, I.K.	-	-	O	O	O	O
730. Polozkov, S.A.	+	+	+	+	+	+
731. Polosin, V.S.	+	+	+	+	+	+
732. Polyakov, Yu.N.	-	-	+	-	-	-
733. Polyantsev, P.M.	-	-	O	O	O	O
734. Ponamereva, T.A.	-	O	+	O	-	+
735. Ponomarev, A.A.	+	O	O	O	O	O

Some Results of Roll-Call Voting

Name	Questions					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
736. Ponomarev, K.P.	+	-	O	O	-	O
737. Ponomarev, L.A.	+	+	+	+	+	+
738. Popkov, N.N.	+	+	+	+	+	+
739. Popkov, O.V.	O	+	+	+	A	+
740. Popov, V.D.	-	-	+	-	-	O
741. Popov, N.I.	O	+	+	+	+	A
742. Poptsov, O.M.	+	+	+	+	+	+
743. Posazhennikov, V.G.	+	-	+	-	-	+
744. Potapov, A.A.	-	+	+	+	+	+
745. Pochinok, A.P.	+	+	+	+	+	+
746. Prilukov, V.M.	-	-	+	-	-	+
747. Prokofyeva, N.N.	+	+	O	-	-	+
748. Prokhorov, V.Ya.	+	-	A	A	-	+
749. Prudnikov, V.N.	+	+	+	+	+	+
750. Prusov, A.L.	O	+	+	-	O	-
751. Prytkov, V.N.	O	-	+	-	-	+
752. Pugach, S.G.	+	+	+	+	+	+
753. Pudovkin, Ye.K.	+	+	+	+	+	+
754. Pustovoy, V.P.	-	-	+	A	-	+
755. Putilov, E.P.	+	+	+	+	+	+
756. Putintsev, V.K.	+	+	+	-	+	O
757. Pushkina, T.A.	+	+	+	+	+	+
758. Pyrkov, V.A.	O	+	+	+	+	+
759. Radionov, A.I.	+	+	+	-	-	+
760. Rayfikesht, V.F.	+	+	O	+	+	O
761. Rakov, P.P.	+	+	+	+	+	+
762. Rasskazov, V.P.	+	+	+	+	+	+
763. Rassokhin, G.V.	+	+	+	+	+	+
764. Rebinskiy, S.G.	+	-	+	-	+	+
765. Rebrikov, V.A.	+	+	+	+	+	+
766. Revyakin, V.S.	O	+	O	+	+	+
767. Redkin, V.Ya.	-	-	+	-	-	+
768. Rezaykin, V.I.	-	O	+	-	-	+
769. Repin, N.V.	+	+	+	+	+	+
770. Reshulskiy, S.N.	-	O	O	-	-	-
771. Rogacheva, I.A.	+	+	+	+	+	+
772. Rodin, S.B.	+	-	+	-	A	+
773. Rozhdestvenskiy, V.N.	A	-	+	+	-	+
774. Rozbitova, L.N.	-	A	+	-	-	O
775. Rokitskiy, M.R.	+	+	O	O	O	O
776. Romanenko, V.P.	O	+	+	+	+	+
777. Romanov, N.I.	+	O	O	O	O	O
778. Romanov, F.F.	A	-	+	-	O	+

Some Results of Roll-Call Voting

Name	Questions					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
779. Roshchin, V.A.	-	-	O	O	O	+
780. Roshchupkin, I.P.	-	-	-	-	-	O
781. Rudenko, A.K.	+	-	+	-	-	+
782. Rudkin, Yu.D.	+	-	+	O	O	+
783. Rumyantsev, O.G.	+	+	+	+	O	+
784. Ruppel, K.K.	-	+	+	-	+	O
785. Rutskoy, A.V.	O	O	O	O	O	+
786. Rybkin, I.P.	-	O	+	-	-	+
787. Ryzhov, Yu.A.	+	+	+	+	+	+
788. Rymorov, I.T.	-	-	+	-	-	O
789. Ryumin, V.V.	+	+	+	+	+	+
790. Ryabov, A.I.	O	-	-	-	-	O
791. Ryabov, N.K.	+	+	+	+	+	+
792. Ryabov, N.T.	+	+	+	+	+	+
793. Ryabukhin, P.P.	-	-	+	-	A	O
794. Sabirov, M.G.	-	-	A	-	-	-
795. Savin, N.A.	O	-	O	O	O	+
796. Savitskiy, O.V.	+	-	+	+	+	O
797. Savchenko, I.S.	O	-	+	+	-	A
798. Sadykov, Yu.V.	O	O	O	O	O	+
799. Sayenko, G.V.	O	-	-	-	-	O
800. Salye, M.Ye.	+	+	+	+	+	+
801. Salnikov, S.V.	+	-	-	-	-	+
802. Samoylov, S.N.	+	+	+	-	+	+
803. Sanayev, V.I.	O	O	A	-	A	+
804. Sandal, A.L.	-	-	+	O	+	+
805. Sarayev, B.A.	-	-	O	O	O	O
806. Safonov, A.Ye.	-	-	O	-	-	-
807. Safronov, L.P.	+	+	+	+	+	+
808. Sevastyanov, V.I.	-	-	-	-	-	O
809. Sevostyanov, Yu.V.	+	-	+	+	+	+
810. Sedov, Ye.N.	-	+	O	O	O	O
811. Seleznev, V.V.	+	+	O	O	O	O
812. Seleznev, V.N.	O	-	+	-	-	+
813. Selivanov, A.G.	+	-	+	-	-	A
814. Semeyzhin, M.F.	-	+	+	-	+	+
815. Semenov, M.Ye.	O	-	+	-	-	O
816. Semenov, Yu.N.	O	-	-	-	-	+
817. Semukhov, Yu.I.	O	+	+	+	A	O
818. Sergeyev, Ye.V.	+	+	+	+	+	+
819. Sergeyev, Yu.S.	+	+	O	O	O	O
820. Serdyukov, V.A.	O	O	O	+	+	+
821. Sereda, G.M.	+	+	+	+	+	+

Some Results of Roll-Call Voting

Name	Questions					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
822. Seryakov, V.S.	-	-	+	-	-	+
823. Seslavinskiy, M.V.	+	+	+	+	+	+
824. Sivak, A.V.	O	A	+	+	+	+
825. Sivova, N.A.	+	+	+	+	+	+
826. Sivchenko, G.A.	-	-	+	-	-	O
827. Sidorenko, Yu.S.	O	+	+	+	+	+
828. Sidorchuk, A.A.	O	-	O	-	-	O
829. Sipayev, V.N.	+	+	+	-	A	+
830. Silchenko, V.V.	-	+	+	+	+	+
831. Simonov, A.A.	+	+	+	+	+	+
832. Sirotkin, S.V.	+	+	-	+	+	+
833. Sitnov, V.V.	+	+	+	+	-	+
834. Sklyarov, I.P.	O	O	O	-	-	+
835. Skomorokhov, N.F.	+	+	+	+	+	+
836. Skripchenko, V.V.	+	+	+	+	+	+
837. Skrynnik, V.T.	-	+	+	+	+	+
838. Skudnov, V.A.	+	+	+	-	+	O
839. Slobodkin, Yu.M.	-	-	+	-	-	A
840. Smagin, N.A.	+	+	+	+	+	+
841. Smirnov, V.V.	-	-	+	-	-	O
842. Smirnov, I.N.	-	-	+	O	O	+
843. Smirnov, I.I.	+	+	+	+	+	O
844. Smirnov, R.M.	+	+	+	+	+	+
845. Smirnov, S.A.	+	+	+	+	+	+
846. Smirnov, Yu.A.	+	+	+	+	+	+
847. Smolin, O.N.	O	+	+	A	+	+
848. Smolskiy, G.A.	-	O	+	-	-	+
849. Sokolov, A.S.	O	-	+	-	-	+
850. Sokolov, V.S.	-	-	O	O	-	-
851. Sokolov, S.N.	+	+	+	+	+	+
852. Sokolov, Yu.V.	-	-	+	-	-	+
853. Solovyev, A.N.	+	+	+	-	+	+
854. Solovyev, V.A.	A	-	+	+	-	+
855. Solovyev, V.D.	O	+	+	-	A	+
856. Solodyakova, N.I.	-	-	O	O	O	O
857. Sondykov, V.S.	+	+	+	+	+	+
858. Sorokin, G.N.	+	-	A	-	O	+
859. Sorokina, M.I.	+	+	+	+	+	+
860. Sofronov, L.S.	-	A	+	-	+	+
861. Spasov, M.A.	+	O	+	+	+	O
862. Spirin, V.M.	-	-	+	-	-	+
863. Spitsyn, A.I.	-	-	+	-	-	+
864. Starkov, V.A.	O	+	+	+	+	+

Some Results of Roll-Call Voting

Name	Questions					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
865. Starovoytova, G.V.			O	O	O	O
866. Starodubtsev, V.A.	+	+	+	+	+	+
867. Stelikov, A.I.	O	O	O	O	O	+
868. Stepanikov, V.G.	-	+	+	-	A	-
869. Stepanov, V.N.	O	-	O	-	-	+
870. Stepanov, D.Ye.	+	+	-	+	+	+
871. Stepashin, S.V.	+	+	+	+	+	+
872. Stolyarov, V.N.	-	-	-	-	-	+
873. Stroyev, Ye.A.	O	A	+	-	+	+
874. Struchkov, V.V.	+	-	+	-	-	+
875. Sturov, V.K.	+	A	+	-	+	O
876. Sumarokov, V.M.	+	+	+	+	+	+
877. Sumin, P.I.	+	-	+	-	-	+
878. Surganov, V.S.	-	-	+	-	-	+
879. Surkov, A.B.	+	O	O	-	+	+
880. Surkov, A.P.	+	+	+	+	O	+
881. Suturin, P.G.	-	-	+	-	-	O
882. Sukharev, V.P.	O	+	+	+	+	+
883. Syrovatko, V.G.	-	-	O	O	O	+
884. Sysoyev, A.V.	-	-	A	A	A	O
885. Tarasov, A.M.	+	+	+	-	O	+
886. Tarasov, B.V.	-	O	-	-	-	+
887. Tarasov, Ye.A.	+	+	+	+	+	+
888. Tarasyuk, Yu.F.	+	+	+	+	+	+
889. Temirov, U.Ye.	-	-	-	-	O	O
890. Teterin, V.N.	+	+	+	+	+	+
891. Timofeyev, V.A.	+	O	O	O	O	O
892. Titkin, A.A.	+	+	+	+	+	+
893. Tiunov, O.I.	O	-	O	O	O	O
894. Tikhomirov, A.N.	O	+	+	+	+	+
895. Tikhomirov, V.N.	O	-	+	-	-	O
896. Tikhonenko, V.D.	+	O	O	-	-	O
897. Tikhonov, V.A.	O	+	+	+	+	+
898. Tikhonov, V.I.	+	+	+	+	+	+
899. Tikhonov, V.P.	+	+	+	+	+	+
900. Tikhonov, R.Ye.	+	+	+	+	+	+
901. Tkachev, A.A.	-	-	+	-	-	O
902. Tolstikov, Yu.I.	+	+	O	-	-	O
903. Tolstoy, M.N.	+	+	+	+	+	+
904. Tolstoy, N.A.	+	+	+	+	+	+
905. Toporkov, V.F.	-	-	-	-	-	O
906. Toropov, V.I.	O	-	+	O	-	O
907. Travkin, N.I.	+	+	+	O	+	+

Some Results of Roll-Call Voting

Name	Questions					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
908. Travnikov, V.N.	+	+	+	+	+	+
909. Travov, V.P.	-	-	-	-	-	O
910. Trubitsyn, M.M.	+	+	+	+	-	+
911. Tuykov, V.I.	-	-	-	-	-	+
912. Tuleyev, A.M.	+	O	+	-	-	+
913. Tumov, M.M.	+	-	+	+	-	+
914. Turusin, A.A.	+	+	O	O	O	O
915. Turyanov, A.Kh.	+	O	+	+	+	+
916. Tushnolobov, G.P.	-	-	+	-	-	+
917. Tyurkina, N.S.	-	+	+	+	+	+
918. Uvachan, V.V.	-	-	+	-	-	O
919. Ugarov, A.A.	-	+	+	+	+	+
920. Uglanov, A.I.	O	+	+	+	+	+
921. Udalov, V.V.	-	+	+	A	A	+
922. Udalova, A.P.	-	+	+	-	+	+
923. Udachin, V.Ya.	O	-	+	-	+	+
924. Udovenko, V.P.	O	+	+	+	+	+
925. Umetskaya, S.I.	+	+	+	+	+	+
926. Urazhtsev, V.G.	+	+	+	+	O	+
927. Urusov, A.G.	-	+	+	+	-	+
928. Ustinov, I.G.	+	+	+	-	O	+
929. Utkin, A.K.	+	+	+	+	+	+
930. Utkin, V.B.	O	+	+	+	+	+
931. Fadeyev, G.M.	-	-	O	-	-	-
932. Fadeyev, Yu.P.	-	-	+	-	-	+
933. Fakhrutdinov, V.Sh.	+	+	+	+	+	+
934. Fedorov, A.Yu.	O	+	+	+	+	+
935. Fedorov, V.P.	+	O	O	O	O	O
936. Fedorov, V.I.	-	-	+	-	-	+
937. Fedorov, D.L.	+	O	O	O	O	O
938. Fedorova, M.P.	O	+	+	+	+	O
939. Fedorchenko, V.A.	O	+	+	+	+	+
940. Fedoseyev, I.V.	-	-	+	-	-	+
941. Fedotov, V.Ya.	+	+	+	-	-	+
942. Fetisov, S.N.	+	+	+	-	+	+
943. Filatov, S.A.	+	+	+	+	+	+
944. Filippov, V.M.	+	-	O	-	-	O
945. Filippov, P.S.	O	+	+	+	+	+
946. Filyuk, A.L.	-	+	+	+	-	O
947. Firyulin, I.I.	+	-	+	-	-	+
948. Fomin, V.K.	+	+	-	+	+	+
949. Fomin, V.S.	O	-	+	-	-	+
950. Fomin, G.M.	+	+	+	+	+	+

Some Results of Roll-Call Voting

Name	Questions					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
951. Fomin, Yu.V.	-	-	+	-	-	-
952. Formozov, B.N.	O	+	-	+	+	O
953. Frolov, V.A.	+	-	O	-	-	+
954. Frulakov, V.V.	O	O	O	-	-	+
955. Khabibullin, Kh.Kh.	+	O	+	-	-	O
956. Khabriyev, R.U.	+	-	+	-	-	+
957. Khayryuzov, V.N.	O	-	+	-	-	+
958. Khakimov, B.V.	+	+	+	+	+	+
959. Khamatov, K.N.	O	+	O	O	O	O
960. Khamzin, R.A.	+	-	O	O	O	+
961. Kharayev, F.A.	+	+	+	+	+	+
962. Kharitonov, M.M.	-	O	+	-	-	+
963. Kharitonov, N.M.	+	-	+	-	-	+
964. Kharlov, A.I.	O	-	+	+	A	+
965. Khasbulatov, R.I.	O	+	+	+	+	+
966. Khaustov, V.T.	+	+	+	+	-	+
967. Khetagurov, S.V.	-	-	O	-	A	O
968. Khlebnikov, I.G.	-	O	+	-	-	+
969. Khoroshilov, G.I.	-	-	+	+	+	+
970. Khramchenkov, Yu.P.	+	-	O	+	+	+
971. Khritonenkov, D.K.	+	+	+	+	+	+
972. Khrulev, Yu.K.	+	+	+	+	+	+
973. Khubiyev, V.I.	-	+	+	+	-	+
974. Khutyz, A.I.	+	+	+	-	-	+
975. Tsann-kay-si, F.V.	+	+	+	+	+	+
976. Tsapayev, V.N.	O	-	+	-	-	O
977. Tsarev, A.Yu.	O	+	+	+	+	+
978. Tsarkova, V.S.	O	+	+	+	-	+
979. Tsoy, V.	-	O	+	-	A	+
980. Tsybikzhapov, E.D.	+	+	+	+	+	+
981. Tsybikov, Ye.N.	O	-	+	+	+	+
982. Chaykovskiy, A.F.	-	-	+	-	-	+
983. Chaykovskiy, V.M.	-	O	+	-	-	-
984. Chapkovskiy, Yu.K.	-	O	O	O	O	O
985. Chaptynov, V.I.	+	-	+	-	-	O
986. Chausskiy, N.A.	+	+	+	+	-	-
987. Chebotarevskiy, R.Z.	A	-	+	-	-	A
988. Chelnokov, M.B.	+	O	+	+	+	+
989. Cherepanov, I.M.	O	O	+	-	-	+
990. Cherepkov, N.A.	O	-	+	-	-	+
991. Chernov, V.Ye.	O	-	A	-	-	+
992. Chernov, V.G.	O	O	O	O	O	O
993. Chernov, V.V.	-	+	+	+	+	+

Some Results of Roll-Call Voting

Name	Questions					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
994. Chernukhin, N.A.	O	O	O	O	O	O
995. Chernykh, V.D.	+	-	+	A	A	+
996. Chernyshev, A.A.	-	-	-	-	-	O
997. Chesnokov, V.A.	+	+	+	+	+	+
998. Chetin, I.V.	-	-	O	O	O	O
999. Chefranov, B.N.	-	O	O	O	O	O
1000. Chibisov, A.Yu.	+	+	+	+	+	+
1001. Chibisov, V.I.	-	A	+	A	A	+
1002. Chikin, V.V.	-	O	O	-	-	O
1003. Chikunov, A.G.	+	+	+	+	+	+
1004. Chirokov, V.G.	-	O	+	-	-	O
1005. Chistyk, O.A.	+	O	+	O	+	+
1006. Chichkanov, I.N.	O	+	+	+	+	+
1007. Chmarov, N.I.	+	+	+	-	-	+
1008. Chudetskiy, B.N.	+	+	+	-	O	+
1009. Churikov, A.A.	-	-	A	-	-	-
1010. Churilov, V.A.	O	+	+	-	+	+
1011. Churkin, V.N.	A	+	+	-	+	+
1012. Chukhin, I.I.	+	+	+	+	+	O
1013. Shabad, A.Ye.	+	+	O	+	+	+
1014. Shabunin, I.P.	O	+	+	+	O	O
1015. Shamshin, V.P.	-	-	+	-	-	-
1016. Shapochkin, V.V.	+	-	+	-	-	+
1017. Sharadze, O.Kh.	O	-	A	-	-	+
1018. Sharifullina, Ye.A.	O	+	+	+	A	+
1019. Shatalov, S.D.	+	+	+	+	+	+
1020. Shakhray, S.M.	+	+	+	+	+	+
1021. Shasviashvili, I.A.	-	A	+	-	-	O
1022. Shashkov, V.V.	-	+	+	-	-	O
1023. Sheboldayev, S.B.	+	+	O	+	+	O
1024. Shevtsov, A.Ye.	+	-	+	-	O	O
1025. Shevtsov, V.V.	+	-	+	-	-	+
1026. Shevchenko, N.P.	-	-	+	-	-	O
1027. Sheynis, V.L.	+	+	+	+	+	O
1028. Shelov-Kovedyayev, F.V.	+	+	+	+	+	+
1029. Shibalov, V.I.	O	-	-	-	-	+
1030. Shinkaretskiy, V.I.	+	+	+	-	+	+
1031. Shipovalova, L.S.	+	+	+	+	O	+
1032. Shirobokov, I.I.	A	+	+	+	+	O
1033. Shikharev, Yu.I.	+	+	+	+	+	+
1034. Shishkin, V.A.	-	-	+	-	-	+
1035. Shishkin, N.N.	+	-	+	+	+	+
1036. Shorin, V.P.	-	-	+	-	+	O

Some Results of Roll-Call Voting

Name	Questions					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
1037. Shtygashev, V.N.	-	O	O	O	O	O
1038. Shuba, N.M.	O	+	+	+	+	+
1039. Shuykov, V.A.	O	+	+	+	+	+
1040. Shulyatyev, G.F.	-	-	O	-	-	O
1041. Shumeyko, V.F.	+	O	O	O	O	O
1042. Shumskiy, A.A.	-	+	+	+	-	+
1043. Shustov, S.P.	+	+	+	+	+	+
1044. Ettyryntyna, M.I.	-	O	+	+	O	O
1045. Yuganov, Ye.V.	-	-	A	-	-	O
1046. Yugin, V.A.	O	+	+	+	+	+
1047. Yugov, S.I.	+	+	+	+	+	+
1048. Yudin, V.V.	+	+	+	+	+	O
1049. Yudin, Yu.A.	+	+	+	+	+	+
1050. Yurin, A.P.	-	O	+	+	-	O
1051. Yusnikov, N.S.	+	-	+	-	-	O
1052. Yushenkov, S.N.	+	+	+	+	+	+
1053. Yushkevichus, V.E.	+	+	+	+	+	+
1054. Yakimenko, N.T.	+	+	+	+	+	O
1055. Yakovlev, V.B.	+	+	O	O	O	O
1056. Yakovlev, S.D.	+	+	+	A	+	+
1057. Yakubovich, N.D.	-	A	O	-	A	O
1058. Yakunin, G.P.	+	+	+	+	+	+
1059. Yar, S.P.	O	+	+	-	+	O
1060. Yarov, Yu.F.	O	-	+	-	-	+
1061. Yaroshenko, A.I.	+	-	O	-	-	-
1062. Yasenkov, L.Ye.	O	O	+	-	-	+

From the Editor

At the First Congress of People's Deputies of the RSFSR, the question of the practice of roll-call voting was raised repeatedly. Some even stated that this is "an instrument of coercion," "a whip for free expression of the deputy's will," and so forth.

In any rule-of-law state, there exists two forms of voting: open and secret. The legislators decide which of them to prefer in a specific instance. To protect the interests of the minority, the Regulations of the Congress of People's Deputies of the RSFSR provides for a roll-call voting procedure if at least one-fifth of the deputies favor it.

Why do certain deputies persistently speak out against roll-call voting? Obviously, it is because they have become used to living in conditions of a "dual philosophy," a "double political standard," when they proclaim one idea and pass decisions nullifying it.

Democracy gives any deputy the right to have his point of view and voters the right to know it.

Western Republics

Belorussian Ministries, Departments To Be Reduced

LD2307181390 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1700 GMT 23 Jul 90

[Text] The number of ministries and state departments in Belorussia is to be reduced by one third with the transition of its economy to market relations. At its first session the republican Supreme Soviet is currently endorsing its administrative structure according to a provisional scheme, but it has already become known that the Ministry of Everyday Services will be the first to cease to exist. In the next few months this branch will start operating under market economy conditions.

Belorussia Rewords Constitution Article 6

PM2307125390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Jul 90 Second Edition p 2

[BELTA-TASS report under the general heading: "At Union Republic Sessions"]

[Text] Minsk, 20 Jul—The multiparty system has been reflected in the Belorussian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Constitution. The republic's Supreme Soviet adopted at the second attempt a new version of Article 6. It now runs as follows: "Political parties, public organizations, and mass movements are entitled, through their representatives elected to soviets and in other forms, to participate in elaborating the Belorussian SSR's political course and the idea behind its economic, social, and spiritual development and in the running of state and public affairs."

Contenders for Ivashko Office Named

PM2007115590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Jul 90 Second Edition p 1

[Report by own correspondent M. Odinets: "Ukrainian Government in Formation"]

[Text] Kiev, 18 Jul—Work on forming the Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] government continued today at a republic Supreme Soviet session. On the recommendation of its head, V. Masol, A. Tkachenko was confirmed as first deputy chairman of the Ukrainian Council of Ministers, and V. Fokin and V. Borisovskiy as deputy chairmen by majority vote.

Then, after long debate, the session resolved to examine the resignation of V. Ivashko as chairman of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet. It was also resolved to continue discussion of the state management structure of the Ukrainian SSR proposed by V. Masol.

At the evening session V. Ivashko's resignation was accepted and candidates for the chairmanship of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Council put forward. N. Khomenko, I. Yukhnovskiy, L. Kravchuk, A. Burlyanda, S. Gurenko, N. Artemenko, V. Yavorivskiy, I. Plyushch, and others figure among the contenders nominated.

New Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Chairman Elected

LD2307190990 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 23 Jul 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Today a new chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] was elected. Leonid Makarovich Kravchuk, second secretary of the republic's Communist Party Central Committee, has become the chairman. He has become head of the Ukrainian parliament after a difficult struggle. Twenty-seven candidates from different parliamentary groups were standing for this post.

Leonid Makarovich Kravchuk is 56 years old. He worked as a lecturer in political economics. He is a Candidate of Economic Sciences. He has been employed in party work since 1960.

Oliynk Cited on Ukraine's Sovereighty Declaration

LD2307105490 Kiev International Service in Ukrainian 1800 GMT 21 Jul 90

[Text] Boris Oliynyk, deputy chairman of the Nationalities Chamber of the USSR Supreme Soviet and member of the Communist Party of the Ukraine Central Committee, stated at a press conference in Kiev that following the adoption by the Ukrainian parliament of the Declaration on Sovereignty, our republic will become the factor that may influence the political climate not only of Europe, but of the entire world. By passing the declaration, the Ukrainian parliament has put to the fore generally accepted humane notions, namely that it will fight for both the republic's sovereignty and for the rights of all nations and ethnic groups living in Ukraine.

Ukrainian Nationalists Seek Own Army

PM2007124190 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 20 Jul 90 First Edition p 4

[Report by Captain Third Rank V. Yermolin under rubric "Ukraine: Political Review": "When the Gopak Becomes a... Weapon"]

[Text] Kiev, Lvov, Moscow—On 16 July many days of extremely sharp debate at the Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet culminated in the adoption of a "Declaration on the State Sovereignty of the Ukraine."

I saw the start of the discussion of this historic issue. To be blunt, the rather nervous, emotional approaches to the topic did not promise swift consensus among deputies even on individual points of the future declaration. Moreover, the difference between the positions of the main parliamentary currents was common knowledge. The first position is formulated in the 28th Ukrainian Communist Party Congress resolution "The Establishment of Real State Sovereignty for the Ukrainian SSR on the Basis of the Union Treaty." The second in general terms appears to be this: total and unconditional statehood outside the USSR. With some divergences with regard to the time frame and nature of secession from the USSR, it was reflected in one way or another in the programs of the newly formed parties (Ukrainian Social Democratic Party, Ukrainian Republican Party, Ukrainian National Party, Ukrainian Peasant Democratic Party, and others).

The breakdown of forces in parliament seemed to be such as to provide supporters of the Ukrainian Communist Party with a constant edge in terms of votes. Arithmetical computations prompted some observers to say that the struggle between the "Democratic Bloc" and the parliamentary majority was a foregone conclusion. Especially as initially the "democrats" were constantly on the losing side in votes. However, the absence from the session of the group of communist deputies who were taking part in the 28th CPSU Congress, and then V. Ivashko's statement that he was quitting the post of

chairman of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet enabled the "Democratic Bloc" to strengthen its positions.

Be that as it may, the shifts in the dispositions of the parliamentary groupings resulted in a productive conclusion to the debate on the Ukraine's state sovereignty. The precedence of the republic's Constitution and laws over the Union Constitution and laws was declared, thereby taking the first step toward profound transformations. Something else that can be put down as a victory for the "Democratic Bloc" is the paragraph of the declaration asserting that the republic has the right to have its own Armed Forces and also saying that citizens of the Ukrainian SSR, as a rule, do [military] service only on the republic's territory and cannot be used for military purposes outside it without the consent of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet.

Of course, there is a certain distance between the declaration and its implementation through laws. Presumably the deputies have envisaged everything and—this is clearly KRASNAYA ZVEZDA readers' greatest concern—the process of the planned changes in the republic will not adversely affect the position of troop units stationed on the Ukraine's territory, as has happened in Lithuania, for instance. I would like to believe that (again remembering the "Lithuanian scenario") the nation's awakened self-awareness will not result in buckets of mud being slung at the "occupiers" and in a wish to divide peoples into victims and butchers. Especially today, when the prospect of renewing the republic by parliamentary means is clear and when other republics, including Russia, are moving in the same direction, and are sometimes further ahead in some respects.

In conversation with me, Ivan Fedorovich Drach, the acknowledged leader of "Rukh" [Ukrainian People's Movement for Perestroyka], was quite definite: Yes, there are drawbacks to the movement toward independence, but the nationalists will never call the tune in the Ukraine, and Russians, Belorussians, and Ukrainians have always been and will remain blood brothers. And therefore the very attempts to portray the USSR Armed Forces as an occupation army and the USSR as an aggressor against the Ukraine are absurd. Certainly the friendliest of relations will remain between the Ukrainian state and the USSR, as is appropriate between good neighbors. "Rukh" is a force that guarantees only good changes in relations between the Ukrainian people and other peoples. Ivan Fedorovich is confident of that.

However, even in the "Rukh" apparatus I have been unable to discern unity of views on the Ukraine's past and future. For instance, unlike I. Drach, A. Sergiyenko, chief of the Rukh Information Center Day-to-Day Information Department, has no doubt that the USSR Armed Forces are an occupation army.

"Your Army," Aleksandr Fedorovich told me, "has always been alien to us. It has never defended the Ukrainian people but has always engaged in violence against them."

The logical constructs of this experienced journalist relying on the extremely long list of Stalin's crimes will certainly produce an impression, and maybe an indelible one, on the man in the street, who is unaccustomed to studying history on the basis of documents. The archives of history contain deeds and events to suit every taste. You need only choose. And Aleksandr Fedorovich has already chosen everything for himself. Now he is choosing for others. He even blames the Red Army for the liberation of the Ukraine from fascism—"Stalin buried Hitler in corpses," he says, and such a victory is worse than a defeat.

My interlocutor is not an ordinary performer in "Rukh." Having noted that, you are no longer surprised when, hundreds of versts from Kiev, young people selling Ukrainian Nationalists Organization symbols, or a chance traveling companion on a train, or an energetic woman picket outside the republic's Supreme Soviet tell you the same thing almost word for word. Yes, unfortunately it is not Ivan Fedorovich Drach whom I most often recognized in the emotional outbursts of the politicized masses but Aleksandr Fedorovich Sergiyenko, who is presumably just as 100-percent a member of "Rukh" as its chairman. And even these are not the most diametrically opposed positions, particularly regarding the military question.

I. Drach unequivocally declared to me: "'Rukh' has no concept of military building." On the other hand many of those who are in favor of unconditional separatism bluntly said: The Ukrainian Republic needs its own army. Moreover, work to create Ukrainian armed forces is already under way, albeit feebly and poorly. Thus Lieutenant Colonel G. Voroshilov, military commissar of Yavorovskiy Rayon in Lvov Oblast, showed me "Recommendations to Draftees and Reservists Called Up for Service in the USSR Occupation Forces." This document, in particular, recommends that if people receive a draft notice they immediately notify the Committee for the Creation of Ukrainian Armed Forces and resolutely avoid serving in the Army.

What exactly is the Committee for the Creation of Ukrainian Armed Forces? It was created through the efforts of youth movements which attach paramount importance to the idea of an independent state. One of the founders of the committee is the Independent Ukrainian Youth League. The cochairman of this organization is Oleg Vitovich, people's deputy in the Lvov Oblast Soviet. Here is a brief account of his views on the rebirth of the Ukraine, which he shared with me during a personal meeting.

Above all he is in favor of the Ukraine's immediate secession from the USSR. In favor of prohibiting the Communist Party's activity and putting its members on trial. His ideal is the Ukrainian state as a uninational superpower. "We could become a world leader of fashions in the sphere of culture and language." But in order to become a strong power, there is a need for a strong army. "We have territorial claims against Russia—

Voronezh and Kursk Oblasts and Krasnodar Kray—Poland, Czechoslovakia, Romania, and, of course, Moldova. Such issues are scarcely resolved by peaceful means. The third millennium will begin with interethnic wars. And we must be ready for this."

Vitovich is opposed to Ukrainians serving in the USSR Armed Forces, but, if someone nevertheless does decide to go and do military service, that is also all right. Let him study military matters, there will soon be a need for such people. In principle it would be correct to create Ukrainian national forces on the basis of the material base that today belongs to the Soviet Army. "We are already recreating the structures of the Ukrainian national army, admittedly only at the level of camps in the Carpathians. We are training the guys in the combat gopak ('lead is sewn into traditional baggy trousers, then a single kick will leave four dead'), other types of unarmed combat, and firearms... But the main thing at these camps is not the physical training but the spiritual training. We carry out ideological work with the descendants of the Sech riflemen. The young people study history and meet with veterans of the national liberation movement. And generally mature ideologically. Our ideology is the ideology of Stepan Bandera. Hence the traditions borrowed from the Ukrainian Nationalists Organization."

On the eve of our meeting Oleg Vitovich said in a speech to a large rally:

"We dream of a superpower. We dream of a nation that towers over all other nations! We have before us an enemy, whose name is Moscow. It will be a fight to the death against it. Either the Muscovites will beat us, or we will beat them. There is no other option... Tomorrow new regiments and battalions of Ukrainian Nationalists Organization members will rise up and will lead us to victory... The Ukraine for the Ukrainians!"

People listened to him, applauded him.

When I shared my impressions of this speech with Vera Dmitriyevna Lyaskovskaya, deputy chairman of Lvov Oblispolkom [Oblast Soviet Executive Committee], she smiled:

"Little kids... No one is seriously going to let them carry out their intentions. Their parents won't let them."

However, the 23-year-old "little kid" Oleg Vitovich will be 33 on the threshold of the 21st century—the century of interethnic wars, according to his forecast. What will be his relations then with those who today watch his activity with a patient, condescending smile?

I am sure that V. Lyaskovskaya, who as deputy chairman of the oblast draft commission did much to ensure that the spring draft proceeded in an organized fashion and without excesses, does not share Oleg Vitovich's great-power aspirations. But, a big but, she is not in any hurry either to publicly condemn them. Just like, incidentally, the deputies of the oblast soviet, who are perfectly well informed about their colleague's political predilections. Meanwhile he is vigorous in attaining his objectives and is far more popular among young people than the functionaries of the local Komsomol [Leninist Communist Youth League] organization.

So it looks as though the declared right to the republic's own army will fall not on stony ground but on very well cultivated ground prepared for the long-awaited shoots. Be that as it may, a number of further organizations that aspire to the role of basic subunit of a national army are operating in the Ukraine today in addition to the aforementioned enthusiasts for "military matters." You can talk as much as you like about their weakness, isolation from the broad masses, lack of prospects, naivete, and so forth, but it would be dangerous self-confidence not to take into account the fact that they exist.

One final point. There is a great difference between the views on the Ukraine's future held by I. Drach, the humanist writer, and O. Vitovich, the convinced member of the Ukrainian Nationalists Organization. But what ultimately is "Rukh's" national patriotic idea if it allows such dissimilar individuals to shelter beneath the same banner? And where will it ultimately lead those who today trust it implicitly?

Ukraine To Mark 'Days of Cossack Glory'

LD2307115890 Kiev International Service in Ukrainian 1800 GMT 21 Jul 90

[Excerpt] Days of Cossack glory will begin in Dnepropetrovsk Oblast in the first days of August. Let us remind you that three outstanding anniversaries will clash this summer: the 500th anniversary of the descent of freedom-loving Ukrainian Cossackdom; the 300th birthday anniversary of the Zaporozhian Cossack leader, Petro Kalnyshevskyy; and the 310th anniverary of the death of the outstanding leader of the Zaporozhian Cossacks, Ivan Sirko. [passage omitted]

Monuments to Lenin, Marx To Be Dismantled

LD2307163790 Kiev International Service in Ukrainian 1800 GMT 20 Jul 90

[Text] The Ternopol town council has adopted a decision to dismantle the monuments to Marx and Lenin, and also all monuments perpetuating military vehicles and objects. The council's spokesman revealed that proposals to this effect were lodged long ago by inhabitants of Ternopol, and were also voiced at sittings of the town council, commissions, and at meetings.

It has been decided to demolish the monuments by the 400th anniversary of Ternopol which falls in early October. This decision, he went on, can be annuled by court order or as a result of a general referendum.

Caucasus

Armenian Supreme Soviet Session Opens

LD2007181190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 20 Jul 90

[Text] After a lengthy recess that was caused by protracted elections to parliament, the first session of the Armenian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet of a new convocation began its work today. The deputies spent a few hours on procedural matters, but time is extremely valuable for the republic that finds itself in a most complex situation. Vazgen I, Catholicos of all Armenians and USSR people's deputy, recalled this in his speech again. He called for consolidation for the sake of overcoming the crisis and stabilization of the sociopolitical situation. The deputies have to form the working bodies of the parliament, elect the chairman of the Armenian Supreme Soviet and his deputy chairmen, and discuss the issues relating to the republic's independence and sovereignty. Movsisyan, member of the CPSU Central Committee politburo and first secretary of the Central Committee of the Armenian Communist Party, spoke at the session.

Arms Seizures Viewed

NC2207124390 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 0500 GMT 22 Jul 90

[From the review of KHORHRDAYIN HAYASTAN]

[Text] The first meeting of the first session of the 12th convocation of the republic's Supreme Soviet (?lasted longer than scheduled). There was an intense debate about who should be the chairman of the credentials commission. Finally, the Supreme Soviet granted temporary and equal chairmanship rights to the two members of the commission and instructed the commission to study the elected deputies' credentials.

Galstyan, the republic's internal affairs minister, briefed the session about a new incident in which arms were seized from border troops; this might have led to a serious clash. He demanded that the Supreme Soviet set up a special commission to conduct negotiations with the suspected arms snatchers. Deputies did not endorse this proposal and indicated that the law enforcement bodies should look into the matter. The minister was asked to take measures in this direction and then to brief the Supreme Soviet.

Late in the evening the minister spoke at the session and provided unsatisfactory information. This led to a flood of questions and an acute clash of opinions.

Dissatisfaction was expressed concerning the work being carried out to clarify the reasons behind the tragic clashes which took place on 27 May this year in Yerevan and on exposing the culprits. The session asked for more comprehensive information on this.

The Supreme Soviet also endorsed a declaration to the effect that the subunits of the Soviet Army and USSR internal troops have no right to undertake any punitive act on the territory of Armenia without the permission of the Supreme Soviet.

Gevorgyan, the republic's procurator, delivered a report at the morning session on 21 July. He proposed the formation of a parliamentary commission which will be provided with the results of the investigation into the May incidents. The deputies rejected that (?proposal) (?arguing that) a relevant permanent (?commission) will look into that matter.

Deputy Kazaryan spoke about the illegal (?acts) being committed against the indigenous Armenians in Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast. He proposed that necessary measures be taken to counter the forced alteration of the demographic situation in the autonomous oblast and to ensure the Armenian population's security.

The Supreme Soviet also heard the report of the credentials commisson delivered by the temporary chairman of the commission, [name indistinct]. After examining the report of the credentials commission, the Supreme Soviet, in accordance with Article 100 of the republic's Constitution, decided to recognize the authority of the 161 people's deputies presented to the Supreme Soviet.

During the debate on the report presented by the credentials commission, the issue of recognizing the credentials of Baruyr Ayrikyan, who was elected people's deputy of the republic, was brought up prominently.

Following prolonged debates, (?members of the tellers commission) were also elected. [passage indistinct]

Soviet Army Actions Viewed

LD2107185790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 21 Jul 90

[From the "Vremya"newscast]

[Text] The Armenian SSR parliament of the new convocation is working for the second day. Here is a report from today's session of the Armenian Supreme Soviet.

[Unidentified correspondent] It was after midnight and Saturday 21 July had begun when the new Armenian parliament's first day of work ended. One can say that the concluding document adopted at the session in the early hours of this morning was a statement regulating the implementation of any punitive acts by the Soviet Army and USSR Internal Troops on the territory of Armenia without permission for such from the republican parliament. This document did not emerge by chance: As early as the middle of the day, Galstyan, the republican minister of internal affairs, made a statement at the session on an attack, alleged to have occurred the previous day, on a unit of troops in order to seize

weapons and hostages. A special commission of deputies, which had traveled to Artashatskiy Rayon as specified by the minister, totally refuted this information on its return.

The deputies again continued work today on the formation of the session's working organs. Today's session, like yesterday, proceeded too emotionally, occasionally even sliding in the direction of excessive nervousness. But overall, the body of deputies, whose work is being watched on television for the second day by the whole population of the republic, is, in spite of all the complexity of the problems facing them, finding a democratic path to resolving them. The session will rest tomorrow and the day after. On Tuesday, the republic's parliament will again continue its work.

Difficulties Discussed

LD2207093490 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 21 Jul 90

[Text] In Armenia the session of the republic's Supreme Soviet is continuing its work. Our correspondent Koryun Khumaryan reports:

The process of forming the new Armenian parliament is difficult, unbelievably difficult. Yesterday, during the formation of the credentials commission and the election of its chairman, it finally became clear that not a single public force represented in the Supreme Soviet, including the Communist Party and the Armenian National Movement, has a sufficient majority to be able to take any decisions without compromise, or if you like without each other. As a result, it was difficult to form a credentials commission yesterday, and in electing the credentials commission chairman the deputies made a judgement of Solomon—they elected two co-chairmen. There is a fierce struggle in discussing any theme, even seemingly insignificant ones. And this is, unfortunately, understandable. There is a cruel battle for power in the republic, and this begins by occupying key positions in the Supreme Soviet.

The whole of today will be devoted to the report of the credentials commission on the deputies' authority. The credentials commission has verified the authority of only 161 of the 195 deputies confirmed by the central electoral commission. This is, of course, too few, but is nevertheless a step forward; at least the Armenian parliament already exists officially and is working. But unfortunately it is working unproductively. The tellers commission is still being formed.

Movsisyan Addresses Armenian Party Plenum

LD2307153890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 23 Jul 90

[Text] In Yerevan today, there was a plenum of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee. It discussed the draft platform of the republic's Communist Party for its congress, which will be held in November. A program statement was adopted. In particular, it says that in reinterpreting the past and freeing itself from administrative-bureaucratic methods, the Armenian Communist Party is manifesting a committed readiness to transfer power to the soviets, while retaining the right to struggle for leadership on an equal footing with all other movements. The document is being published in the press for nationwide discussion. A speech was made at the plenum by Movsisyan, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of the Central Committee of the republic's Communist Party.

Armenia's Trade Ties Decision Endorsed

NC2207103990 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1800 GMT 21 Jul 90

[From the republican press review]

[Text] According to KHORHRDAYIN HAYASTAN, the Armenian Council of Ministers has endorsed the 29 June decision of the USSR Council of Ministers on additional measures to encourage Armenia's enterprises, associations, and organizations to engage in foreign economic relations in connection with eliminating the earthquakes' consequences.

Beginning 1 July, the decision allows registration of joint enterprises set up in Armenia with participation of foreign nationals. Permission has also been given to conclude independent agreements with foreign firms regarding cooperation in international tourism. The decision also provides for developing a material-technical basis for tourism.

The Union government has endorsed the proposal of the Armenian Council of Ministers to create a trade bank for shareholders. The bank will be set up by Soviet state enterprises, associations, and organizations and will fulfill tasks concerning eliminating the earthquakes' consequences.

Yerevan Committee To Function Independently

NC2107130590 Yerevan ARMENPRES International Service in Armenian 1215 GMT 20 Jul 90

[Text] Yerevan, 20 Jul (ARMENPRES)—Proceeding from the results of the 28th CPSU Congress, the Yerevan city soviet executive committee [gorispolkom] has decided that in order to democratize its future activities, it will henceforth function independently of any party or public organization. The residents of the capital are duly informed of this decision. Under the existing conditions, the gorispolkom will concentrate its efforts on mobilizing the Yerevan residents' energies, on normalizing the situation, and on solving the social and economic problems, which is vital for the capital and the republic.

Nagorno-Karabakh Control Committee Suspended

LD2307121490 Baku BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY in Russian 14 Jul 90 p 3

["Decision of the Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet on Suspending the Activity of the People's Control Committee of the NKAO in the Azerbaijan SSR"]

[Text] Taking into consideration the fact that for a long time the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] People's Control Committee has been carrying on its activity in spite of its status and in flagrant violation of the constitution of the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] and the laws of the republic while infringing the USSR law "On People's Control in the USSR," having virtually broken its ties with the Azerbaijan SSR People's Control Committee and doing all it can be prevent their restoration and in view of the petitioning of the Azerbaijan SSR People's Control Committee the Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet decides:

1. To suspend the operation of the People's Control Committee for the NKAO in the Azerbaijan SSR.

2. To entrust the duties of the NKAO People's Control Committee to the republican organizing committee for the NKAO in the Azerbaijan SSR.

[Signed] E. Kafarova, chairman of the Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet.
Baku, 26 June 1990

Azerbaijan Suspends Gadrutskiy Rayon Powers

LD2307121390 Baku BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY in Russian 14 Jul 90 p 3

["Decision by the Supreme Soviet of the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic, SSR, On Suspending the Powers of Gadrutskiy Rayon Soviet of People's Deputies and its Executive Committee"]

[Text] Despite measures being taken by the Azerbaijan SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet, the president of the Azerbaijan SSR, and the government of the Azerbaijan SSR to restore peace and law and order in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO], the Executive Committee and most of the deputies of the Gadrutskiy Rayon Soviet of People's Deputies are under the thumb of extremist forces and have, in fact, taken the road toward separatism. They are initiating various illegal actions on the territory of the NKAO. In effect, many of the deputies have been at the head of the extremist, nationalist movement in the rayon.

The Executive Committee of the Gadrutskiy Rayon Soviet of People's Deputies occupies the most active anticonstitutional position. The latest provocative step was the energetic participation by the Executive Committee in inciting the illegal campaign to elect Armenian SSR people's deputies for the NKAO which took place in the rayon despite the 3 March 1990 decision by the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium declaring the elections null and void.

All these actions are accompanied by the whipping up of the situation in the rayon and by open terror and intimidation of the population. There are a variety of extremist groups operating in Gadrutskiy Rayon with virtual impunity. With complete disregard for common sense, people responsible for perpetrating acts of violence and terrorism are not being made to face criminal and administrative responsibility. Bodies of soviet power are not acting to put a stop to the activities of people whose aim is to use violent means to dismember the territory of the Azerbaijan SSR.

The situation was inflamed even more and relations between the Azerbaijan and Armenian population were made still worse by the election of the first secretary of Gadrutskiy Rayon G. L. Bagiyan as Armenian SSR people's deputy for constituency No. 259 Gadrutskiy Rayon.

Because nationalist hysteria was artificially whipped up during this action, the situation was aggravated in the villages of Tug and Akhullu in Gadrutskiy Rayon. Population points came under fire more often and road blocks became more frequent. Internal troops detained a group of terrorists on the territory of the rayon and confiscated a large quantity of explosives and weapons.

In connection with continuing resistance to the decisions of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet to normalize the situation in the NKAO, and in order to prevent the escalation of tension and to safeguard the security of citizens in Gadrutskiy Rayon in the NKAO in the Azerbayjan SSR, the Supreme Soviet of the Azerbaijan SSR decides:

1. To suspend the powers of the Gadrutskiy Rayon Soviet of People's Deputies and its Executive Committee until a new soviet is elected.

2. To appoint a temporary organizational bureau to carry out the operational management of the sociopolitical and socioeconomic life of Gadrutskiy Rayon made up as follows: Chairman of the Organizational Bureau, Comrade Zubkov, second secretary of Nizaminskiy Rayon of the Azerbayjan Communist Party in the city of Baku, chief of the Political Department of Gadrutskiy border detachment, and three representatives of the Armenian population of the rayon.

3. To establish that the organizational bureau is directly subordinate to the republican organizing committee for the NKAO and to the highest bodies of state authority and government in the republic and has all the powers of the rayon's Soviet of People's Deputies and its Executive Committee while the chairman of the Organizational Bureau has the rights and duties of the chairman of the Executive Committee of the rayon Soviet of People's Deputies.

To entrust the Organizational Bureau with the leadership of local bodies of state power and government and also to hand over the apparatus of the Executive Committee of the rayon Soviet of People's Deputies to it as a working body.

4. To instruct the organizing committee for the NKAO to take the relevant decisions arising from this decision.

[Signed] E. Kafarova, chairman of tyhe Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet
[Dated] Baku, 26 June 1990

Tbilsi District Officer's House Picketed

LD2107082590 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0600 GMT 21 Jul 90

[Text] Since 18 July, ad participants in mass meetings have been laying seige to the district house of officers in the Georgian capital. Name plates have been torn from the door of the building and the red flag has been torn down from the pediment. From morning until evening, the excited crowd demands that the House of Officers be vacated immediately. Threats and calls for violence can be heard. The party for Georgia's National Independence has acted as the organizer of this outpouring of people's will.

Lately, passions around the Army in the republic have been running extremely high. Fuel was added to the fire by the law on alternative work service which was adopted the end of July [month as heard] at the latest session of the Supreme Soviet of the Georgian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic]. Alarming reports on desertion by servicemen of Georgian nationality are being received from the units.

Central Asia

Further on Osh Oblast Interethnic Conflict

Curfew Extended; Groups Banned

LD2307125290 Moscow TASS in English 1247 GMT 23 Jul 90

[By TASS correspondent Boris Maynayev]

[Text] Frunze July 23 TASS—The city of Osh in Soviet Kirghizia, the site of recent bloody clashes, was calm this morning, KIRTAG News Agency reported.

"There is no shooting in the city, many shops have reopened and the bus service has also resumed operation," the agency said. "Extremist attempts to generate further tension on Sunday were resolutely cut short by law enforcers."

Nonetheless, Major-General Viktor Goncharov, commander of trouble-hit areas that have been under a state of emergency, issued an order extending curfew from 21:00 until 6:00 and banned groups of more than three persons in the streets.

The order also prohibited any gatherings at homes and allowed house searches without authorisation from the local public prosecutor.

A fact-finding commission from the Soviet parliament has, in the meantime, ended its work in the region. The government adopted a decision to increase aid to Kirghizia, in particular to ease the unemployment problem among its young.

According to official statistics, some 80,000 people are jobless in Kirghizia today, nearly half of them in the Osh region.

The city of Uzgen remains sealed off by barricades. Motor vehicles managing to get past the road blocks are escorted by troops. They continue to be ambushed and stoned.

Russians Voice Concerns

LD2307142990 Frunze Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 23 Jul 90

[Text] Groups of people representing the Russian-speaking section of the population of Osh started to gather on the central square of the town from the morning of 22 July. These were workers of the pulp and paper association, the pumping works, the housing construction combine, building and transport organizations, other enterprises and establishments, pensioners and housewives. In view of the fact that holding meetings is prohibited under the state of emergency, they were invited into the hall of the house of political education belonging to the oblast party committee. Dzhumagulov, chairman of the Kirghiz Council of Ministers; Chepelev, second secretary of the Communist Party of Kirghizia Central Committee; Sydykov, first secretary of Osh Oblast party committee; Mamyrov, first secretary of the Osh town party committee; Colonel General Shatalin, commander of USSR Internal Troops; and Goncharov, republican minister of internal Affairs and commandant of Osh Oblast, arrived to meet them.

Those gathered said that the tragic events had found a painful echo in the hearts of honest people, and that everyone feels deeply everything that happened. It is essential carefully to analyze the causes that led to the bloody conflict and arrest its real organisors and incitors, those who had brought two fraternal peoples into conflict.

Those taking part in the meeting noted that the process of normalizing the situation in the town is still proceeding slowly and insisted on more resolute measures for establishing order and for returning to normal as quickly as possible the work of industry, transport, trading and public catering enterprises and children's preschool establishment.

Serious complaints were levelled at people's deputies of the Kirghiz SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] and the oblast and town soviets; at the time of the pre-election campaign, during meetings with inhabitants, they did

not spare their promises and pledges, but now when trouble has arrived, those at the meeting said, you neither see nor hear anything of people's deputies.

The question was also raised that more rigorous demands have to be made on the managers of enterprises and organizations who are biding their time, acting passively, and doing nothing to restore normal working rythm to the town. It is not right that those who have been working during these days and those who have been sitting it out at home should receive the same pay, there should be no levelling here. It was noted with concern that the instability and lack of reliable guarantees of citizens' safety is generating a desire to migrate among part of the Russian-speaking population.

The leaders of the republic, oblast and town, while sharing this concern, explained what measures are being taken to allay the wave of migration and to prevent a mass exodus of Russian families. No one will gain from this, neither the Kirghiz, nor the Uzbek, nor the Russian population themselves, it was stressed at the meeting. Trust among people of different nationalities as to be strengthened by joint efforts, and subversive acts directed at inflaming interethnic hostility have to be curtailed. It is essential to show reason and not to yield to an outburst of passions and emotions. The internationalist labor collectives of the town are called upon to play a decisive role in stabilizing the situation and estblishing order. Dzhumagulov, Chepelev, Sydykov, Mamyrov, Shatalin, and Goncharov gave detailed replies to numerous questions from those taking part in the meeting, and provided explanations of problems concerning people.

'Grave' Situation Viewed

LD2307162690 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 23 Jul 90

[Video report by Osh special correspondent A. Poklad, including recorded remarks by Kirghiz Council of Ministers Chairman A. Dzhumagulov; place and date not given; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] On the situation in the city of Osh. We have just received a report from our special correspondents.

[Correspondent A. Poklad, identified by caption] Making the situation more civilized and halting the strife are the demands of the overwhelming majority of the multinational population of Osh Oblast. Today's key event was the meeting between the republic's leadership and residents of the town of Uzgen. This is where the most serious casualties and the worst destruction have been caused. The situation in this part of the oblast has a significant effect on the situation in the republic as a whole. The path toward reconciling the two sides is difficult. Too much has been experienced, and wounds are still open. It will take time to heal them, but it is essential today that normal life be resumed and people return to their homes, to their own land, from the refugee camps.

[Dzhumagulov] After what was, indeed, a serious exacerbation of the state of affairs—starting last Sunday and lasting until Wednesday and Thursday inclusively—the situation is now getting back to normal. It cannot be said to date that the tension has been completely eased. The tension is extreme and grave. But nonetheless, there have been serious changes for the better. The transport of the city of Osh is working today, and transport between cities is operating, as are shops. The bazaar is working. In a word, in a day or two we hope that the situation in the city and the oblast will be normalized. But this does not mean that the tension will have been eased. Unfortunately tension exists. The pain that has been caused, and the wounds that have been inflicted on the Kirghiz and Uzbek peoples and on the peoples living here in Kirghizia are deep, and we understand this. But we will do everything to heal it as soon as possible. [video shows aerial views of residential area, showing damage to buildings; a meeting; interview with Dzhumagulov]

Masaliyev on Stabilization

LD2307164690 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 23 Jul 90

["Interview with Kirghiz Supreme Soviet Chairman A. Masaliyev, by unidentified correspondent, place and date not given; from the "Vremya" newscast—recorded]

[Text] [Masaliyev] Today we took a number of practical steps which would lead to the stabilization of the situation. Above all we looked at personnel questions. This is a fundamental question. Problems and questions arise periodically on this topic.

Before this we strengthened the leadership of the town of Osh—part of the oblast center—part of the large rayon of Kara-Su, and part of Uzgen Rayon. This was prior to the congress.

A session of the oblast soviet of people's deputies has taken place. The question of the statement by the chairman of the oblast executive committee was examined here, who in connection with these events, having considered his possibilities himself, stated that he did not have the moral right to lead the oblast executive committee because he is answerable for what has happened, and so submitted the matter for discussion by the oblast soviet. Taking into account the structure of the population, taking into account the history of the oblast's development and the prospects for strengthening the friendship between the people who live here and, on the whole, taking into account all the specific features of the oblast, the candidacy of a comrade who by nationality is an Uzbek—Comrade (Isabayev) who was a secretary of the oblast party committee—was settled on.

He has a command of both the Kirghiz and Russian languages. Brought into this process have been the party

aktiv of the republic and of the oblast; and party, labor, and war veterans both on the part of Uzbek comrades and of the Kirghiz. The other day a joint conference was held here with Uzbek and Kirghiz aksakals [elders]. A wide-ranging and frank comradely conversation took place, and it was agreed that the situation must be settled as quickly as possible. I think that this will have an effect. In this context party and soviet bodies need to elaborate their actions every day: Otherwise we will probably not achieve our aim. [video shows Masaliyev seated at desk in office with male correspondent seated opposite him]

Ministry Outlines Situation

LD2307190290 Moscow TASS in English 1817 GMT 23 Jul 90

[By TASS correspondent Aleksandr Borisov]

[Text] Moscow July 23 TASS—Contradictory reports on the situation in the Osh region arrive from Kirghizia. According to the USSR Interior Ministry the situation continued to be extremely tense over the past 48 hours.

On July 21 crowds formed in various parts of the Osh city. A fight flared up betwen Kirghiz and Uzbeks in front of the service centre. Two people were injured.

A local resident, Uzbek Yusupov, was killed as a crowd was being dispersed near the campus. Another Uzbek, a brick factory worker, was injured by a home-made bomb explosion in the street.

On July 21, fourteen people applied for medical aid and five of them were hospitalized. Two cases of arson were reported.

On the same day, a crowd of Kirghiz residents from outlying residential areas, numbering nearly 3,000, tried to enter the city of Uzgen, but was prevented from doing so by security forces. Another crowd, mainly women from the village of Ilychevka, also numbering up to 3,000, tried to enter the city from another direction. On their way, the women dismantled the barriers earlier erected on the Osh-Uzgen road, the USSR Interior Ministry reported.

Tension in interethnic relations between Kirghiz and Uzbeks persisted on Sunday. No clashes on interethnic grounds took place thanks to measures taken by security forces, the USSR Interior Ministry stressed.

At 10:30, 100 representatives of the Russian-speaking population met the republican leaders at the Kirghizia Communist Party regional committee to discuss personnel politics, improvement in trade and work of preschool establishments for children.

Despite the efforts taken, 30 distribution network centres were closed across the region on Sunday.

An unauthorized rally, involving up to 1500 Uzbeks and Kirghiz, was held in the village of Kotak of the region's Frunze district. Speakers at the rally demanded proportional representation of Uzbeks and Kirghiz in law-enforcement agencies, the lifting of the curfew and the removal of Meskhetian Turks from the town of Kyzyl-Kiy.

During the past 24 hours, five hunting rifles were seized in the region, and 122 people were detained for violating the curfew.

Deputies Study 'Conflict'

LD2307194790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 23 Jul 90

[Interview with G.K. Kryuchkov, head of a group of USSR people's deputies visiting Osh Oblast, by studio announcer; from the "Vremya" newscast—live]

[Text] [Announcer] Here in the studio we have Georgiy Korneyevich Kryuchkov, head of the group of USSR people's deputies that has been visiting Osh Oblast on the instructions of the Supreme Soviet Presidium of our country. Georgiy Korneyevich, what are the results of the group's work?

[Kryuchkov] The group has studied the causes of the conflict that has arisen and, in conjunction with republican organisations, has determined practical steps toward the further normalization of the situation: above all toward engaging in active work, in normal work, in all the main centers of vital activity, of the essential services of the oblast as a whole, and of the oblast center; toward getting public catering, trade, transport, and industrial enterprises and construction organizations working; toward stepping up the resettlement of refugees in their places of residence—this is an acute issue; toward-stepping up the investigation of the causes and all crimes; toward bringing people to account—help is also needed in this; and toward other necessary measures.

[Announcer] In your view, when all is said and done, is there a hope that the interethnic conflict will be defused?

[Kryuchkov] In spite of all the bitterness, in spite of all the hatred which, unfortunately, determines the situation to a great extent at present, one would like to hope that both peoples will find it in them to overcome the hostility and restore the fraternal relations that have existed for decades. Of course, there is an immense amount of work here for all public, party, local soviet, and other organizations.

[Announcer] Have the results of your group already been reported?

[Kryuchkov] Yes, today we reported the results of the group's work to Comrade Lukyanov, chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, who assured us that the conclusions and proposals will be reported to the country's president and to the leadership of the government, and that the necessary measures that have to be taken by the center will be taken. Although, frankly, it should be said that the main work needs to be done

locally. [video shows Kryuchkov seated next to the announcer in the "Vremya" studio]

Commission Opens Investigation

LD2107130990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 21 Jul 90

[Text] A commission of the USSR Supreme Soviet has begun its work in Osh Oblast in Kirghizia. It should study the situation that has come about and work out practial recommendations to normalize it. Members of the commission have met representatives of the mass news media. It was noted that particular responsibility is laid on journalists for objective and balanced appraisals in coverage of events that are taking place. Unfortunately one-sided and unauthentic information which can in no way promote the attainment of peace and accord is being permitted in certain publications.

Commission Visits Rayons

LD2307062190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 2300 GMT 22 Jul 90

[Text] As we have already reported, a USSR Supreme Soviet commission is working in the Osh Oblast of Kirghizia. Here is Aleksandr Mirtov, our correspondent.

[Mirtov] Members of the commission have been visiting different rayons of the oblast. They met with people and visited the refugee camps. A lot of things, of course, have been discussed. None of the most burning and harsh problems has been passed over. They are, first of all, the return of people to their permanent addresses, and restoration and construction of new houses, as well as social and everyday facilities which have been damaged and burned down. The USSR Council of Ministers has allocated considerable funds in order to help the republic. First of all, the problem of employment of the population should be resolved. The leadership of the republic and oblast should, of course, reveal their energy and adroitness in this matter. Sharing his impressions, Georgiy Korneyevich Kryuchkov, the head of a commission of deputies; deputy chairman of the committee for legislation, legality, and law; and order of the USSR Supreme Soviet, said:

[Begin Kryuchkov recording] When the life of the oblast center of the oblast [as heard] has been disrupted, it is difficult to talk about any sort of normalization. When shops are closed and motor transport does not work people are not likely to be in a good mood. It is possible to understand an ordinary toiler who has decided for one reason or another not to turn up at work. But, if a leader does not show up at work then it makes it difficult to count on order being restored. If we are to talk about ways out of this particular situation then the main thing will be to look for ways of bringing people together regardless of whatever might happen; this is the main thing. We will not manage to get it right the first time. And, we were told that one community had invited another one to harmonize relations. It did not work out for them. If it does not work out today, it has to be done tomorrow. If it does not work out tomorrow, it has to be done the day after tomorrow. It has to be done every day. And I think we should act much better through such things as a council of elders, women's councils, internationalist servicemen, a healthy section of youth. I am, as well as all the members of our group, fully convinced that it won't be easy to heal the wounds and overcome the alienation which has, to our deep sorrow, appeared here among individual section of people. And nobody but the Kirghiz, Uzbeks, Russians, Uighurs, and other nationalities which live in your republic will be able to overcome it. [end recording]

Students, Manager Killed

LD2407073790 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0600 GMT 24 Jul 90

[Excerpt] Here is our Kirghizia correspondent Aleksandr Mirtov on events in Osh Oblast:

[Mirtov] On the whole there has been no significant change in the situation in Osh Oblast, Kirgizia, over the past 24 hours. Thanks to vigorous action by the law enforcement bodies and military subunits, the number of fights and other instances of mass disorder has been reduced. Nevertheless, a warehouse manager was killed yesterday by unidentified persons at Osh's [word indistinct] cargo depot, and some students from the Osh Medical Academy were killed in a city bus, again by unidentified persons. [passage omitted]